DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 895 CE 000 102

AUTHOR Heasley, Daryl K.
TITLE Opinions Expressed by County-Based Professional Extension Agents and Lay Extension Personnel Upon Introduction of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program. A Case Study in Selected Northeast States.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Cooperative Extension Service.
NOTE 100p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Educational Programs; *Extension Agents; *Extension Education; *Opinions; Program Evaluation; Role Conflict; *Statistical Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Expanded Youth Nutrition Program

ABSTRACT

Agriculture, home economics, and youth extension agents and lay advisors were surveyed in 41 counties of four northeastern states to assess their attitudes toward the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program (EYNP). It is concluded that innovative programs for new clientele such as EYNP need to be initiated along with a training program for extension profession and lay personnel to minimize their adjustment problems and to maximize potential resources for implementing the programs. New programs must develop organizational structure and content at the same time. A "grass roots" vs. "top down" dichotomy hinders smooth initiation of new programs. More than half of the volume is devoted to tabular presentation of the data. Appendix D is a separate five-page paper, Role Strain Expressed by Extension Agents upon Introduction of a New Program: A Case Study in Selected Northeast States; Summery and Conclusions." (MS)

ED 081895

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081895

Opinions Expressed by County-Based Professional Extension Agents and Lay Extension Personnel Upon Introduction of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program A Case Study in Selected Northeast States

Preliminary Report
by
Daryl K. Heasley
Rural Sociologist, Extension
Section of Community Affairs
Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Cooperative Extension Service
College of Agriculture
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Acknowledgments

The author is deeply indebted to the many individuals who helped in the progress of this study. Special appreciation is due: My advisor, William M. Smith, Jr., whose counsel and advice throughout the study were most helpful; M. E. John and Robert C. Bealer, both of whom gave invaluable aid during the study; James Longest, University of Maryland, Louis Ploch, University of Maine, and Enoch Tompkins, University of Vermont, who served as the coordinators for the data gathering phase of the study in their respective states; the administrators and involved field personnel of the Cooperative Extension Services of Maine, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Vermont for their cooperation with the study and; the Rural Sociology and Agricultural Economics Department and the Cooperative Extension Service of The Pennsylvania State University for the necessary resources and facilities to complete the study. Finally, to the respondents who made the analysis possible, my deepest and heartfelt "thanks."

Introduction

It was hoped that this study would offer a mechanism by which rural sociologists, other social scientists, and Extension administrators in the Northeast states could cooperate in interstate research and thereby make the results more broadly applicable.[1] This goal has been accomplished through the involvement of other states. These are: Maine, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Vermont.

The entire population available for study represented a total number of forty-one[2] counties in the four states actually participating in the EYNP at the time of this study. Because of the small number of possible counties to be included in the study, it was decided originally to use all of the cases potentially available. This initial decision was slightly revised.

The following, in alphabetical order, are the counties included in this study:

Counties with EYNP		Counties with no EYNP	
PENNSYLVANIA			
Berks	Lackawanna	Beaver	Indiana
Blair	Lawrence	Butler	Lebanon
Bucks	Luzerne	Carbon	Lehigh
Cambria	Lycoming	Clearfield	Northampton
Chester	Mercer	Clinton	Schuylkill
Dauphin	Philadelphia	Columbia	Venango
Delaware	Westmoreland	Warren	
MARYLAND			
Baltimore	Charles	Anne Arundel	Queen Annes
Calvert	Prince Georges	Howard	St. Mary's
Caroline	Somerset	Montgomery	Worchester
MAINE			
Cumberland	Twin	Piscataquis	Somerset
Franklin	Androscoggin		
Oxford	Sagadahoc		
VERMONT			
Chittenden			
Rutland			
Washington			

The respondent categories in both EYNP and non-EYNP counties were to include only those status occupants within Cooperative Extension who were or would be involved at least to some degree with the EYNP at the local or county level. Thus, the respondent categories were to include: 1) Extension Agents:Agriculture; 2) Extension Agents:Home Economics; 3) Extension Agents:Youth; and 4) elected or appointed persons who serve as lay advisors to the professional county Extension workers.

Finally, it should be noted that the respondent categories selected for analysis from EYNP counties in Maine and Vermont were combined to form a "New England" category.

Rate of Questionnaire Return:

A higher percentage of Extension Agents: youth and Extension Agents: home economists who were participating in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program (EYNP) returned completed questionnaires than did the participating Extension agent: agriculture, Extension advisors: lay, or their non-EYNP colleagues. In fact, nearly all respondent categories of participants in the EYNP had a higher percentage of questionnaires returned than did the non-EYNP respondents. The non-EYNP Extension agents: (Maryland and Pennsylvania) agriculture and lay leaders (New England) represented the exceptions, Table 1.

Personal Data:

Respondents from counties that were not actually participating in the EYNP, regardless of their state of residence, were more likely (1) to have been reared and currently reside in a rural area, (2) to interpret their county as being slightly more rural in nature, (3) to be somewhat younger, (4) to have a slightly higher level of formal educational attainment completed and, (5) to have been associated with Cooperative Extension Service for fewer years in comparison with the respondents from the participating counties. Moreover, it appears that the Cooperative Extension Service in all states has attempted to place persons in the general environment that might best fit the person i.e.,urban-oriented persons seem to be employed mainly in the more urban counties, Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Percentages of Direct-Mail Questionnaires Returned by Respondent Categories from Participating and from Non-Participating Counties.

Categories	Pennsylvania Counties		Maryland Counties		New England Counties		Total
	Non-EYNP	EYNP	Non-EYNP	EYNP	Non-EYNP	EYNP	
Extension Agent:							
Agriculture	69	64	100	67	-	71	69
Youth	N.A.	N.A.	100	117[a]	50	100	100
Home Economics	92[b]	93	67	117[a]	50	71	87
Extension Advisors:							
Lay[c]	54	68	N.A.	N.A.	50	43	57
N	13	14	6	6	2	7	48

[a] One participating county in Maryland returned two questionnaires each from the Extension Agent: Youth and Home Economics respondent categories.

[b] One Pennsylvania non-participating county was temporarily without an Extension Agent: Home Economist and so the percentage shown is based on an N = 12.

[c] Two persons were selected to complete the questionnaire in the Lay Advisory respondent category. Thus, the percentages are based on N's double those given at the base of each column.

Table 2. Respondent Personal Background Data	Non-EYNP Co's	EYNP Co's	STATES		New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
			PA	MD		ALL	Non-EYNP	EYNP	ALL	Non-EYNP	EYNP	ALL	Non-EYNP	EYNP	ALL	Non-EYNP	EYNP
								-Total Possible N's-									
	54[a]	75	75	36	18	32	15	17	18	7	11	40	16	24	39	16	23
Where did you grow up? =	49[c]	68	69	31	17	31	15	16	18	7	11	30	12	18	38	15	23
Rural =	78[b]	62	71	71	53	87	93	81	56	57	64	43	58	33	79	87	74
Urban	22	38	29	29	47	13	7	19	44	43	36	57	42	67	21	13	26
Where do you live now?	49	69	69	31	18	31	15	16	18	7	11	31	12	19	38	15	23
Rural	63	46	59	39	56	42	47	38	39	42	36	32	58	16	87	93	83
Urban	37	54	41	61	44	58	53	62	61	58	64	68	42	84	13	7	17
County presently?	48	68	68	32	17	31	15	16	17	7	10	31	12	19	36	15	21
Rural	73	49	57	56	65	52	73	31	65	71	60	48	75	32	69	71	70
Urban	27	51	43	44	35	48	27	69	35	29	40	52	25	68	31	29	30
Childhood family status?	49	69	68	31	18	31	15	16	18	7	11	31	12	19	38	15	23
Middle-class	82	81	76	87	78	81	80	81	83	85	82	87	100	79	76	67	83
Non-middle-class	18	19	24	13	22	19	20	19	17	15	18	13	--	21	24	33	17
Age - 9/1/70	52	68	71	32	18	31	15	16	18	7	11	34	15	19	38	15	23
Less than 35	31	25	33	17	17	32	33	31	33	15	45	31	40	26	16	27	9
35 - 54	57	55	60	50	50	55	60	50	33	42	27	52	47	53	73	73	74
55 years or over	12	20	7	33	33	13	7	19	33	42	28	17	13	21	11	--	17
Formal schooling	52	69	72	31	18	31	15	16	18	7	11	34	15	19	38	15	23
Less than college	19	26	33	--	22	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	7	--	68	50	83
College graduation	43	42	41	48	39	65	67	62	50	33	55	41	33	47	21	27	13
Post graduate work	38	32	26	52	39	35	33	38	50	67	45	56	60	53	11	13	4
Years in Extension	53	70	73	31	18	31	15	16	18	7	11	34	15	19	39	16	23
0 - 2	23	9	16	16	6	23	40	6	17	15	18	15	20	11	8	13	4
3 - 10	38	44	48	58	50	29	13	44	33	56	18	26	27	26	71	68	74
11 or more	39	47	36	26	44	48	47	50	50	29	64	59	53	63	21	19	22

[a] N's will be recorded in this type [b] Percentages will be recorded in this type [c] Actual N's

Table 3. Respondents Personal Background Data by State/Status-Role Categories	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
	Total N's																		
	9	6	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	4	14	2	19	4
Where did you grow up?	9	6	8	6	2	6	1	7	4	8	3	1	12	3	3	13	2	19	4
Rural	89	100	88	100	-	50	100	57	50	63	67	-	34	33	33	85	100	74	75
Urban	11	-	12	-	100	50	-	43	50	37	33	100	66	67	67	15	-	26	25
Where do you live now?	9	6	8	6	2	6	1	7	4	8	3	1	12	3	4	13	2	19	4
Rural	44	50	25	50	50	33	100	14	75	63	67	-	8	33	25	92	100	90	50
Urban	56	50	75	50	50	67	-	86	25	37	33	100	92	67	75	8	-	10	50
County presently?	9	6	8	6	2	6	1	6	4	8	3	1	12	3	4	12	2	19	3
Rural	78	67	38	25	-	67	100	50	75	63	100	100	17	33	75	67	100	74	33
Urban	22	33	63	75	100	33	-	50	25	37	-	-	83	67	25	33	-	26	67
Childhood family status?	9	6	8	6	2	6	1	7	4	8	3	1	12	3	4	13	2	19	4
Middle-class	78	83	63	100	100	83	100	71	100	100	100	100	83	100	50	69	50	84	75
Non-Middle class	22	17	38	-	-	17	-	29	-	-	-	-	17	-	50	31	50	16	25
Age - 9/1/70?	9	6	8	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	3	1	12	3	4	13	2	19	4
Less than 35	56	-	63	-	-	-	100	71	-	36	33	100	34	-	25	31	-	11	-
35 - 54	44	84	38	75	50	50	-	29	25	55	33	-	58	33	50	69	100	73	75
55 or over	-	17	-	25	50	50	-	-	75	9	33	-	8	67	25	-	-	16	25

continued

Table 3. Respondents Personal Background Data by State/ Status-Role Categories	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
	Total N's																		
	9	6	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	4	14	2	19	4
Formal Schooling?	9	6	8	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	3	1	12	3	4	13	2	19	4
Less than college	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	61	50	84	75
College graduate	78	50	38	100	50	33	100	57	50	36	-	100	58	-	50	31	-	16	-
Post graduate work	22	50	63	-	50	67	-	43	50	50	100	-	42	100	50	8	50	-	25
Years in Extension?	9	6	8	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	3	1	12	3	4	14	2	19	4
0 - 2	56	17	13	-	-	17	-	29	-	18	33	-	17	-	-	14	-	-	25
3 - 10	22	-	38	25	100	50	100	29	-	18	33	100	33	-	25	72	50	74	75
11 or more	22	83	50	75	-	33	-	42	100	64	33	-	50	100	75	14	50	26	-

Program Data

Non-EYNP*	Currently our county is not participating in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program: (Check One).
53	But I think our county would be interested in learning about the program.
68	And I don't think our county would be interested in learning about the program at this time.
4	And I don't know the county's feelings toward the program at this time.
28	

*Question was not asked of the participating counties respondents.

About two-thirds of the non-EYNP respondents thought their counties would be interested in becoming involved in the EYNP. Fewer Extension agents: agriculture (particularly those from Pennsylvania) and Pennsylvania respondents in general thought their counties would be interested in EYNP participation than did the other state/region or individual respondent categories (Appendices A and B, Tables 1).

EYNP*	How do you see the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program? (Check the answer that most nearly states your view).
78	
38	It is about the same kind of work Extension has always done but with a new clientele.
43	It is a new program, but integrated with the total county Extension program.
11	It is a new program not integrated with the total county Extension program.
8	I can't really say at this time.

*Question was not asked of the non-participating counties respondents.

Nearly two out of every five persons participating in the EYNP "saw" it as the same program as always but with a new clientele. However, slightly more than two out of every five participants saw the EYNP as a new program that is integrated with the remainder of the Extension program. This latter alternative was endorsed by a higher percentage of Pennsylvania respondents than was the case for the Maryland or New England participants. This difference by state/region has implications for continuing this program and for implementing similar programs in the future. More youth agents and lay leaders responded to this "new, but integrated" alternative than did the home economists and county agents. These regional and individual respondent differences regarding the EYNP will be pursued in continuing research. New England respondents expressed more uncertainity on this question than was the case for their counterparts in the other regions (Appendices A and B, Tables 1). Incidentally, this finding concerning the New England respondents will remain rather consistent throughout the entire report.

EYNP* 73	How do you feel about the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program for low-income persons? (Check one).
66	I am enthusiastic about it.
23	I think it's all right.
10	Don't really know enough about it to decide at this time.
-	It makes no difference to the overall Extension program.

*Question was not asked of the non-participating counties respondents.

Two-thirds of the respondents reported being enthusiastic about the EYNP. The lay leaders, youth agents, county agricultural agents, and county home economists, in decreasing order, reported their degree of enthusiasm toward the program. A higher percentage of the Pennsylvania lay leaders, county agents, and home economists reported being enthusiastic about the EYNP than did their counterparts from Maryland and New England. Maryland youth agents were more enthusiastic toward the EYNP than were their colleagues from New England (Appendices A and B, Tables 1). This latter finding is not unexpected given the general urban focus of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program.

EYNP* 73	How well do you understand the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program? (Check one).
27	I understand it very well.
34	I understand it pretty well.
32	I understand it in general.
4	I don't think I understand it.
3	I don't understand it at all.

*Question was not asked of the non-participating counties respondents.

Three out of every five respondents felt they had an above-average understanding of the EYNP as indicated by their responses to the preceding question. A higher percentage of Pennsylvania respondents reported feeling as if they had a better understanding of the EYNP than did the respondents from Maryland and New England. As might have been expected a higher percentage of respondents most directly involved with the EYNP i.e., the county home economists and the youth agents reported having a better understanding of the program than did the less involved county agriculture agents and the lay leaders (Appendices A and B, Tables 1). One area of further research is to analyze the relationship between understanding and feeling toward the EYNP and what, if any, significance such a relationship has for suggesting program implementation guidelines.

EYNP	Non-EYNP	All	
74	- *	-	Have you ever wanted additional information about this program? (Check one).*
36	-	-	No
64	-	-	Yes: Do you know, in general, where to obtain information? (Check one).
65	50	115	
2	26	12	Not sure
2	22	10	No
96	52	78	Yes

*This part of the question was not asked of the EYNP respondents.

As expected, a higher percentage of all categories of EYNP respondents reported some knowledge of EYNP information sources than did the non-EYNP respondents. Furthermore, nearly two-thirds of the total EYNP respondents indicated a desire for additional information about this program. However, one-half of the county agriculture agents from Maryland and New England and 56 percent of the lay leaders and 38 percent of the county home economists from Pennsylvania indicated they did not want additional EYNP information (Appendices A and B, Tables 1). Perhaps, this finding indicates that these respondents felt they already had adequate information about the EYNP. Perhaps it also indicates the persons less directly involved with the EYNP (i.e.,county agricultural agents and lay leaders) are not too interested in receiving such information. The overall findings lead one to the conclusion that these categories of respondents have received as much information about the program as they desired for the time being. However, one may anticipate their desire for additional information as the program matures.

Non-EYNP*	
30	If contact was made did you find these sources of information helpful?. (Check one).
20	No
80	Yes

*Question was not asked of the EYNP respondents.

Overall, four out of five non-EYNP respondents reported their known sources for EYNP information, when contacted, were helpful. However, five out of every six non-EYNP lay leaders from Pennsylvania reported no help from such sources (Appendices A and B, Tables 1). This latter finding, coupled with the overall finding that one out of five respondents did not receive help from their contacts, gives indication of the necessity for more knowledgeable potential information sources.

Extension's Expanded Youth Nutrition Program is reacted to by different groups in the county. Below please indicate for each group listed your belief as to their general (future or current) approval or disapproval of this program.

Approve			They don't care one way			Disapprove			I don't know their feeling			Group
Non-*	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	
					53	70	123 **					
30	9	18	25	27	26	-	-	-	45	64	56	Low-income persons not in the program.
					48	73	120					
45	67	58	12	12	12	-	-	-	43	21	30	Low-income persons in the program.
					52	72	124					
44	31	36	13	8	10	8	14	11	35	47	43	Farmers.
					52	70	122					
44	20	30	12	13	13	12	11	11	33	56	46	Farm Organizations.
					47	70	122					
68	71	70	2	5	4	2	2	3	28	21	23	Executive Committee.
					47	64	111					
66	64	65	2	5	4	4	2	3	28	29	28	Advisory Committee.
					50	66	116					
48	50	49	8	9	9	2	2	2	42	39	40	County Commissioners.
					52	69	121					
44	26	34	19	20	20	-	-	-	37	54	46	Rural non-farm Extension clientele.
					46	68	114					
43	38	40	11	12	11	-	3	2	46	47	47	Urban Extension clientele.
					57	69	120					
59	55	57	6	7	7	-	7	4	35	31	32	Extension Homemaker's groups.
					53	72	125					
74	83	79	2	4	3	4	-	2	20	13	16	The Professional Extension Staff.
					53	73	126					
79	75	77	-	1	1	-	-	-	39	32	35	State Extension Administration.
					53	74	127					
57	64	61	4	4	4	-	-	-	39	32	35	Welfare Agencies.

*Non- + Non-EYNP ** = Non-EYNP/EYNP/all N's for that row.

A higher percentage of non-EYNP respondents felt that low-income persons not in the EYNP, farmers, farm organizations, advisory committees, rural-non-farm clientele, urban clientele, Extension homemakers groups and state Extension administration would approve of the program than did the EYNP participants. Conversely, a higher percentage of EYNP participants felt that low-income persons in the EYNP, executive committee members, county commissioners, professional Extension Staff, and Welfare agencies approve of the EYNP than was felt by the non-EYNP respondents. Undoubtedly, some rural-urban county differences are being manifested in these answer patternings.

About ten percent of the farmers and farm organizations were believed to disapprove of the EYNP as reported by the respondents. Although the percentages reported here are relatively small, the respondent categories recording this believed disapproval are interesting. Most "farmer" disapproval answers were recorded by the lay leaders, a rather large proportion of whom are farmers, while the Maryland non-EYNP youth agents accounted for most of the "farm organizations" disapproval answers.

Pennsylvania respondents reported a higher percentage of approval of the EYNP by the lay leadership in Extension than did the Maryland or New England respondents. Maryland respondents reported a higher percentage of approval of the EYNP by the professional and administrative Extension personnel than did the Pennsylvania or New England respondents (Appendices A and B, Tables 2). This difference of actual or perceived levels and sources of EYNP support has significant implication for Extension programming.

Overall, the percentages of disapprove and didn't care answers for the EYNP were low while approval and don't know answer percentages were quite high. Logically, one should expect lowering of the don't know answer percentages recorded as the EYNP matures. Continuing study will examine changes in any or all alternatives just mentioned.

The opinions of some of the above groups may be important to you and others not. For each of the groups in the table below please indicate how important to you personally their opinions are of the program.

Very Important			Important			Somewhat Important			Not Important			Group
Non-	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	
					47	*71*	*118*					
40	35	57	34	42	39	21	13	16	5	10	8	Low-income persons not in the program.
					46	*72*	*118*					
63	75	70	28	19	23	9	4	6	-	2	1	Low-income persons in the program.
					49	*69*	*118*					
16	25	21	41	46	45	35	20	26	8	9	8	Farmers.
					48	*68*	*116*					
17	15	16	35	40	38	42	21	34	6	24	12	Farm Organizations.
					44	*60*	*104*					
64	53	58	25	38	31	11	8	10	-	2	1	Executive Committee.
					44	*66*	*110*					
52	62	58	45	30	36	3	8	6	-	-	-	Advisory Committee.
					45	*65*	*110*					
40	52	47	33	37	35	24	9	15	3	2	3	County Commissioners.
					48	*70*	*118*					
21	14	17	44	50	47	27	26	26	8	10	10	Rural non-farm Extension clientele.
					42	*70*	*112*					
31	19	23	40	50	46	21	27	25	8	4	6	Urban Extension clientele.
					49	*66*	*115*					
20	27	24	49	53	51	18	18	18	13	2	7	Extension Homemaker's groups.
					52	*70*	*122*					
75	73	74	17	21	19	8	6	7	-	-	-	The Professional Extension Staff.
					49	*70*	*119*					
67	77	73	29	20	24	4	2	2	-	2	1	State Extension Administration
					49	*70*	*119*					
37	31	34	39	41	40	16	23	20	8	5	6	Welfare Agencies.

The opinions of the more traditional Extension clientele (i.e., farmers and farm organizations) and, in addition, those of the rural-non-farm clientele, urban clientele, homemaker's groups, welfare agencies, and the county commissioners toward the EYNP were reported by a substantial percentage of the various respondent categories as having little or no importance to them personally in this relation. Conversely, the opinions of those persons or groups most closely associated with the EYNP (i.e., low-income participants, executive and advisory committees, the professional and administrative Extension personnel) were reported by the respondents as personally important to them as such opinions related directly to the EYNP. There were some slight differences by degree of respondent's personal importance of these various groupings of persons toward the EYNP respondent categories (Appendices A and B, Tables 3), but generally the patternings of answers just given held regardless of the category of the respondent.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
29	40	69	If you indicated that you feel one or more groups disapprove of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program being a part of your Extension effort and yet their opinions are important to you, do such unfavorable opinions affect the way you do your job?
31	13	20	Not sure
31	58	46	No
38	29	34	Yes
35	45	80	Do you feel there should be census from most groups in the county towards a program before Extension becomes involved?
6	-	3	No opinion
26	56	42	No
68	44	55	Yes

About one-third of the non-EYNP respondents and 58 percent of the EYNP respondents reported that disapproval of the EYNP by one or more groups would not affect their job performance. Perhaps these percentages are relatively high because only a small amount of disapproval was felt to exist toward the EYNP as reported earlier. Perhaps, a sense of "doing one's job" regardless of the feeling towards that job also contributed to the answer patterning in this instance. A higher percentage of lay leaders reported that their work performance would not be affected by disapproval of their roles with the EYNP than was the case reported by the professional personnel (Appendices A and B, Tables 4). The contrasting amount of visibility between lay and professional leaders is undoubtedly a contributing factor in this case.

The fact remains that 69 percent of the non-EYNP respondents and 42 percent of the EYNP respondents indicated--either with

uncertainty or with definiteness--that a feeling of disapproval from one or more of these groupings about their participation in the EYNP would affect their job performance. Maryland and New England respondents were more inclined to answer in this manner than were their counterparts from Pennsylvania (Appendix A, Table 4).

Extension programming has been and apparently still is tempered by a "grass roots" philosophy. In support of such a philosophy, we find that 68 percent of the non-EYNP respondents and 44 percent of the EYNP respondents felt that a consensus should be reached from most groups in a county prior to Extension becoming involved in any new program. Pennsylvania respondents were more apt to report this feeling than were the Maryland and New England respondents (Appendices A and B, Tables 4). This reported feeling is counter to the philosophy by which the EYNP was introduced. These differences have far-reaching implications for organizational administration personnel with regard to the introduction of future programs.

Please indicate how important you think the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program is for (Check one for each item).

Very Important			Important			Not Important						Group
Non-*	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	Non-	EYNP	All	
					52	73	125**					
52	49	50	44	40	42	-	1	1	3	10	7	Broadening the scope of the Extension program.
					53	74	127					Providing educational opportunities for:
34	20	26	40	55	49	8	15	12	18	10	13	Extension workers.
					50	66	116					
14	11	12	48	45	45	6	21	15	32	23	28	Extension Executive Committee Members.
					47	64	111					
15	16	15	45	39	41	9	22	16	31	23	28	Extension Advisory Committee Members.
					52	72	124					
44	21	31	40	56	49	4	11	8	12	12	12	Extension Lay Leaders.
					52	74	126					
46	45	45	42	43	43	6	8	7	6	4	5	Identifying other problems or opportunities within the county for Extension work.
					52	73	125					
33	44	39	40	42	42	10	4	6	17	10	13	Providing additional resources and personnel for county work.
					52	73	125					
31	41	37	42	45	44	5	7	10	12	7	9	Assisting in getting better cooperation among various agencies, county leaders and groups.
					52	74	126					
15	35	27	50	45	47	10	8	9	25	12	17	Providing an additional lever for Extension funding.

*Non- + Non-EYNP

** = Non-EYNP/EYNP/all N's for that row.

The vast majority of respondents reported that the EYNP is important for broadening the scope of the Extension program, providing educational opportunities for particularly the professional personnel and lay leaders, identifying other problems or opportunities within the county for Extension work, providing additional resources and personnel for county work, and assisting in getting better cooperation among various agencies, county leaders and groups. Considerable uncertainty was reported especially by the non-EYNP and by the New England respondents concerning the EYNP's value for providing educational opportunities for executive and advisory committee members and for providing an additional funding lever for Extension. In fact, about one-fifth of the EYNP respondents reported that the EYNP was not important in providing educational opportunities for executive and advisory committee members (Appendices A and B, Tables 5).

Do you think a program such as the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program may lead eventually to changes in the type of person elected or appointed to the following three positions?

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
46	66	112	(a) the advisory committee (Check one).
35	38	37	Not sure
28	17	21	No
37	45	42	Yes
23	25	58	If yes, or not sure do you think these changes will be:
65	29	43	good for the Extension program
-	-	-	bad for the Extension program
35	71	57	not sure for the Extension program
49	59	108	(b) the executive committee
39	37	49	Not sure
27	27	27	No
34	36	35	Yes
23	30	53	If yes, or not sure, do you think these changes will be:
65	37	49	good for the Extension program
-	-	-	bad for the Extension program
35	63	51	not sure for the Extension program
47	72	119	(c) the professional county Extension staff personnel? (Check one).
34	28	30	Not sure
28	18	22	No
38	54	48	Yes
33	45	78	If yes, or not sure, do you think these changes will be:
64	18	37	good for the Extension program
3	2	3	bad for the Extension program
33	80	60	not sure for the Extension program

A substantial percentage of all respondent categories, particularly those from New England and Pennsylvania felt that the EYNP will lead to changes in the type of person Extension elects or appoints at the county level. Moreover, two-thirds of the non-EYNP respondents who answered "yes" or "not sure" to the previous question felt that these changes would be good for Extension while the EYNP participants tended to answer the desirability of such changes with uncertainty (Appendices A and B, Tables 6). Such answer patternings raise many more questions than insights to-date, but hopefully, follow-up research will bring about more clarification.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
50	70	120	How much control do you feel you had or would have in deciding whether this program became a part of Extension's educational program at the County level? (Check one).
10	19	15	Much
50	30	38	Some
30	33	32	Very little
4	19	13	None
6	-	3	Not sure
49	64	113	In deciding whether other programs become a part of the County Extension program do you feel that your amount of control with regard to these other programs is: (Check one).
6	41	26	More than with the Expanded Youth Nurtition Program?
73	53	62	About the same as with the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program?
21	6	12	Less than with the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program?

The majority of respondent categories felt they had little control in deciding whether the EYNP did or would become an on-going part of their County Extension program--the Maryland EYNP youth agents and the EYNP County home economists were the exception (Appendices A and B, Tables 7). Only 10 percent of the Pennsylvania respondents--as compared with one-fourth of their Maryland and New England counterparts--felt they had or would have much say in whether to accept the EYNP as a part of their County program (Appendices A and B, Tables 7).

Forty-one percent of the EYNP participants felt they had more say in accepting programs other than the EYNP than they did with this program. This feeling was particularly true for the EYNP youth agents, home economists and lay leaders (Appendix A, Table 7). This feeling appears to be in direct conflict with the endorsement of a "grass-roots" approach to Extension programming mentioned earlier as important by a majority of the respondents. Such a conflict sets the stage for trade-offs between group maintenance efforts and group task efforts. The final program efforts generated from the trade-offs decided upon represents an unpleasant assignment for administrations.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
			When more than one group enters into a decision-making situation the relative importance of each to the outcome may vary. Considering 100% as a total decision, what part (if any) do you think each of the following SHOULD play in deciding the kinds of Extension educational programs and the types of clientele you will have in your county? Percentages should not exceed 100% total.
---mean % ---			
50	67	117	
27	29	28	Professional County Extension Staff Personnel
15	17	16	Executive Committee
12	10	11	Advisory Committee
17	17	17	Clientele
10	12	11	State Administrators
11	9	10	County Commissioners
7	5	6	State Specialists
-	-	-	Others (please specify). _____
			When more than one group enters into a decision-making situation the relative importance of each to the outcome may vary. Considering 100% as a total decision, what part (if any) do you think each of the following DOES have in deciding the kinds of Extension educational programs and the types of clientele served for your county? (Percentages should not exceed 100% total).
---mean % ---			
50	66	116	
35	31	33	County Extension Staff Personnel
12	10	11	Executive Committee
7	7	7	Advisory Committee
13	15	14	Clientele
13	24	19	State Extension Administrators
7	5	6	County Commissioners
13	8	10	State Specialists
-	-	-	Others (please specify). _____

Generally, the respondents felt that the county professional staff, the state Extension administrators, and the state specialists have a greater role in determining the educational program than these persons should have. Antithetically the respondents felt the executive committee members, advisory committee members, the clientele, and the county commissioners have a lesser role than they should. In this regard, a far higher percentage of the Pennsylvania respondents felt the executive committee members should play a much more important role in determining program than did their Maryland and New England counterparts. This Pennsylvania respondent emphasis generally holds throughout the report. The reverse philosophy holds true regarding the clientele (Appendices A and B, Tables 8).

A high degree of agreement between the non-EYNP and the EYNP resondents concerning the relative importance of each possible category was found. Certainly, this is significant for current and future Extension programming.

Non-EYNP*	In the future, where do you think the majority of the Extension program for the local level will be determined?
53	
19	Local level only
8	Local and State level
11	Federal and State level
51	Local, Federal and State levels
11	All other combinations

*Question was not asked of the EYNP respondents.

The majority of non-EYNP respondents answered on the basis of the traditional "grass-roots" program philosophy of Extension, i.e., at the local level, either alone or in combination with one or more higher levels (Appendices A and B, Tables 9). This expectation for program origination is counter to current happenings. Certainly, some implications for future programming exist regarding this point.

Professional		Lay leader	Committees	Unpaid	
Men	Women	Executive	Advisory	Volunteers	
46	49	44	38	48	What do you think current and future programs of this nature will do to the morale of the Extension Service Personnel at the local level?*
30	41	36	37	40	Strengthen
46	43	50	45	29	No difference
24	16	14	18	31	Weaken

*Question was not asked of the EYNP respondents.

Thirty to 41 percent of the various respondent categories felt the EYNP and similar programs will strengthen the morale of professional and non-professional Extension personnel. The county home economists and the lay leaders especially endorsed this viewpoint. More Pennsylvania respondents felt such programs will weaken morale than did the Maryland and New England respondents. Pennsylvania's professional respondents expressed more concern that such programs would weaken the morale of unpaid volunteer leaders than did the lay leader respondents from Pennsylvania (Appendices A and B, Tables 9). Furthermore it was felt that such programs would be damaging to the morale of the professional-county male personnel. These latter findings suggest further work for administrators from Pennsylvania as they work to resolve perceived, but not necessarily accurate, opinions regarding the feelings of others toward programs such as the EYNP. For example, this finding suggests that new programs will have to be concerned with at least two components (i.e., content and social) in order to be received and implemented with the greatest efficiency.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
52	69	121	Do you think programs of this nature will lead to significant changes in the educational methods and techniques used by Extension?* (Check one).
38	30	34	Not sure
12	19	16	No
50	51	50	Yes

*Wording of question slightly different, but comparable for non-EYNP respondents (Appendix A, Table 10).

A majority of respondents felt programs such as the EYNP will lead to significant changes in Extension's educational methods and techniques. A higher percentage of the New England and Pennsylvania EYNP respondents endorsed this viewpoint than did their Maryland counterparts. A substantial percentage of both categories of youth agents and of the home economists from Pennsylvania in particular also expressed this notion.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
53	71	124	Do you think such programs will change the Extension organization as we know it?* (Check one).
40	42	41	Not sure
26	20	23	No
34	38	36	Yes

*Wording of question slightly different, but comparable for non-EYNP respondents (Appendix A, Table 10).

Twenty percent of the EYNP respondents and 26 percent of the non-EYNP respondents indicated that programs such as the EYNP will not change Extension's organization as we know it, while 34 and 38 percent respectively felt the orgization will be changed. A rather large percentage of the Pennsylvania non-EYNP lay leader respondents, the EYNP county agriculture agents and the Pennsylvania EYNP county home economists felt the organization will not change (Appendices A and B, Tables 10). The respondents who hold an expectation for organizational status-quo would seem to have an unrealistic attitude in view of the past decade's experience. Furthermore, some doubt as to the realism of such a view is given in the large percentages of uncertainty espressed by the respondents.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
52	73	125	What kind of priority in terms of Extension's commitment of personnel and educational resources, do you feel the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program should receive?* (Check one).
56	32	42	High
38	60	51	Medium
6	8	7	Low

*Wording of question slightly different but comparable, for non-EYNP respondents (Appendix A, Table 10).

A far higher percentage of the non-EYNP respondents felt that the EYNP should receive a high priority in terms of Extension's resources than did the EYNP participants. This endorsement for a high priority commitment of Extension's resources to the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program by the non-EYNP respondent categories is in keeping with their feeling that all in all, the EYNP is good for Extension (Appendices A and B, Tables 10).

Both Categories of Youth agents, the non-EYNP county home economists, and lay leaders indicated a need for a high priority of resources for the EYNP (Appendices A and B Tables 10 and 13). This difference of opinions regarding priority of organizational resources at the county level may lead to some organizational problems with staff morale in the long run. Perhaps such a problem is becoming apparent at this time for the professional staff as noted in the following analysis.

EYNP*		
70		Do you feel that the morale of the:
	(a)	Professional Extension Staff Personnel has: (Check one).
11		gotten better because of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program
71		remained about the same since the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program
17		gotten worse because of this program
55	(b)	Advisory Committee Members has: (Check one).
15		gotten better because of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program
76		remained about the same since the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program
9		gotten worse because of this program
57	(c)	Executive Committee Members has: (Check one).
25		gotten better because of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program
63		remained about the same since the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program
12		gotten worse because of this program

*Question was not asked of the non-EYNP respondents.

The majority of respondents indicated that they felt the morale of the county level Extension leadership has remained about the same since the EYNP was initiated. A higher percentage of the Pennsylvania respondents indicated a feeling of worsening morale since the EYNP was initiated than did their Maryland and New England counterparts. The only exception was the New England respondents indication of a morale problem for the professional county staff since initiation of the EYNP (Appendix B, Table 11). Conversely, a fairly high percentage of respondents felt the Extension lay leaders morale has improved since introduction of the EYNP. Again, the notion that those persons not directly involved with administration or teaching the EYNP are more favorable to it than their counterparts received support from these findings.

EYNP	Did the addition of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program to the total Extension program create any difficulties in your county? (Check one).
69	
20	Not sure
22	No
58	Yes
38	Please check all those items that apply.
3	existing programs suffered
3	other staff members were overburdened with an extra load
8	resentment was shown by other Extension clientele
	received increased demands from other agencies for help
3	with similar programs
	had increased difficulty in program planning (If checked,
3	in what ways?)
16	existing programs suffered and staff overburdened
68	all other combinations

Nearly three-fifths of the respondents felt that the addition of the EYNP into their county created some difficulty. Twenty-two percent of that difficulty centered around other staff being overburdened and/or existing programs suffering. Data contained in Appendix B, Table 12 indicate that a higher percentage of the Pennsylvania respondents felt more difficulty with county programs since the EYNP than did the New England or Maryland respondents. The Pennsylvania county home economists particularily indicated increased difficulties with the EYNP. This finding was expected as these latter participants had to administer and teach this educational program. Those states having organizationally designated persons entitled "youth agents" expressed less difficulty in implementing this program than did the Pennsylvania respondents who currently have no such organizational role. This finding points to an area of organizational concern currently being considered at all organizational levels of Extension in Pennsylvania. Ultimate resolution will have far-reaching implications for programming whatever the direction of resolution.

EYNP*	Do you think this program helps to generate a feeling of insecurity on the part of:
71	
	(1). The professional Extension staff
24	Not sure
54	No
22	Yes
67	(2) The non-professional advisory Extension personnel?
30	Not sure
54	No
16	Yes
71	In carrying out this type of program, do you feel? (Check one).
30	Less secure than with other Extension programs
64	Neither more nor less secure than with other Extension programs
6	More secure than with other Extension programs

*Question was not asked of the non-EYNP respondents.

Fifty-four percent of the respondents reported no increased feeling of insecurity on the part of the professional and non-professional county level Extension personnel since the introduction of the EYNP. However, 22 percent indicated more insecurity on the part of professional county staff and 16 percent indicated a similar problem for the lay leaders since the EYNP was introduced into the county. Substantial percentages of all categories of New England respondents, Pennsylvania and Maryland county agriculture agents, and Pennsylvania home economists reported increased insecurity on the part of the professional staff members, since introduction of the EYNP (Appendix B, Table 12). A similar patterning of answers was found for New England and Maryland county agent respondents concerning the non-professional advisory Extension personnel (Appendix B, Table 12). These findings are consistent with one that indicates nearly one-third of the respondents reported feeling less secure with the EYNP than with other Extension programs. Rather high percentages of all categories of Pennsylvania respondents and Maryland county agents reported a similar finding (Appendix B, Table 12). This finding was not unexpected in that the "grass-roots" philosophy was largely discarded with the EYNP implementation and work with this program is concentrated in a non-traditional audience.

EYNP — Do you feel that if the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program becomes a long-term Extension program, other specialized audiences will want equal access to Extension's educational resources? (Check one).

70

59 Not sure
11 No
30 Yes

. . . . . .

46 — If yes or not sure, how do you react to this possibility? (Check one).

43 Favorably
12 Unfavorably
45 No reaction at this time

Thirty percent of the respondents felt that other agencies will want equal access to Extension's educational resources, but 43 percent of these persons had a favorable reaction while 45 percent had no reaction to this possibility (Appendix B, Table 13). Therefore we may conclude from this finding that the anticipated extra demand for Extension educational resources is not perceived as a problem at the county level.

The following questions were asked only of the County home economists and youth agents, and not of the other two respondent categories.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
21	31	52	In working with the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program, do you feel you are required to redefine the way you work as a professional staff member in any way? (Check one).
5	19	13	Not sure
14	23	19	No
81	58	68	Yes
. . . . .			
19	21	40	If yes or not sure, are you unhappy with the necessary changes? (Check one).
21	19	20	Not sure
74	57	65	No
5	24	15	Yes

A considerably higher percentage of the non-EYNP respondents indicated a perceived need to redefine their work role for EYNP participation than was indicated by the EYNP participants. Perhaps, this

perception is unrealistic or maybe, given the more rural setting of the non-EYNP respondents, it is quite reasonable. Further research is planned to help determine which alternative is more correct.

A higher percentage of Pennsylvania respondents indicated a need to redefine their work role than did their Maryland and New England counterparts (Appendix C, Table 1).

Furthermore, nearly one-quarter of the EYNP respondents indicated an unhappiness with such a required role redefinition. As previously mentioned, this finding would seem to reinforce the demand for some concommitant ameliorating programs to help reduce this amount of expressed unhappiness.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
20	32	52	Do you feel that you have more problems in performing your job as a professional educator with the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program than you had previously with Extension Programs? (Check one).
30	22	25	Not sure
25	34	31	No
45	44	44	Yes
	31		If yes or not sure, do you feel that the increase in problems occurred as a direct result of this program? (Check one).*
	16		Not sure
	23		No
	61		Yes

*This part of the question was not asked of the non-EYNP respondents.

Nearly one-half of the respondents reported an actual or preceived increase in problem[illegible]n performing their jobs as educators with the EYNP than was the case previously. Pennsylvania and New England respondents were more likely to indicate increased problems since the introduction of the EYNP than were the Maryland respondents (Appendix B, Table 1). Moreover, 61 percent of the EYNP respondents felt these increased problems were due directly to their participation in the EYNP.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
20	38	56	Do you feel that you have more problems in performing your job than do your colleagues not participating in this program? (Check one).
30	11	17	Not sure
25	23	34	No
45	66	49	Yes

Two-thirds of the EYNP respondents reported feeling they had more problems performing their job as an educator than did their colleagues not participating in the EYNP. Moreover, forty-five percent of the non-EYNP respondents reported a similar feeling. This finding reinforces the previous one, i.e., that the increased problems encountered in performing one's role is due directly to participation in the EYNP.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Specially, how did you handle the reassignment of your time and program priorities for this program? (Check the one that applies most).
21	27	48	
5	15	8	temporarily dropped all other program commitments and relied on lay leadership to carry out these other programs
24	30	27	attempted to carry out both my previous commitments and my new assignment
38	26	31	alloted priority to my new assignment, but did not let the other programs fail
14	7	10	alloted only the minimum amount of time necessary to the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program and carried out my other programs as before
14	7	10	involved my fellow-workers in helping carry out my other programs and commitments (Such as, educational talks, committee assignments and so on).
5	15	13	others

Respondents were nearly equal in indicating two actual or potential alternatives for handling the inclusion of the EYNP into the overall Extension program. These alternatives were: (1) the allotment of priority to the new assignment, while not letting the other programs fail, and (2) attempting to carry out both their previous commitments and their new assignment. In terms of percentages, twice as many non-EYNP respondents indicated potential use of the alternative of attempting to obtain more involvement of fellow-workers in helping to carry out other programs and commitments than was reported as an actual alternative employed by the EYNP respondents. The reverse was true by a 3 to 1 ratio for the alternative of temporarily dropping all other programs and relying on lay leadership to carry out these other programs. Substantial percentages of all categories of home economists endorsed this latter alternative as appropriate (Appendix C, Table 1).

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
21	30	51	Do you feel that you need additional educational background in order to work most effectively with the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program? (Check one).
10	10	10	Not sure
19	10	14	No
71	80	76	Yes
15	24	39	Educational background in what areas? (Check all those that apply).
47	29	36	Nutrition
40	21	28	Housing
27	8	15	Home management
60	38	49	Working with youth
73	58	69	Social sciences
53	38	46	Teaching methods
67	58	64	Administrative methods

The vast majority of respondents expressed a need for additional education in order to work most effectively with the EYNP. In this regard, the EYNP participants expressed a somewhat greater need for additional education than did the non-EYNP respondents. Maryland respondents expressed less need here than did the Pennsylvania respondents, while the New England respondents expressed the greatest need. Obviously the program's urban orientation becomes apparent in the answers to this question (Appendix C, Table 2).

The various kinds of educational alternatives felt to be needed included three traditional home economics categories, one category each for youth, social sciences, teaching methods, and administrative methods. The concentration of response across all respondent categories fell into three areas: working with youth, social sciences, and teaching methods. The Pennsylvania respondents expressed need for help with administrative and teaching methods and social science, while New England respondents wanted help in only the latter two areas. Maryland respondents expressed a need for more help in the areas of nutrition and housing (Appendix C, Table 2).

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	
21	29	50	Please rank in order of importance (1 being the most important; 7 being least important) the following problems for EYNP clientele.
3.0*	2.9	3.0	Housing
4.2	5.3	4.9	Child care
4.5	4.6	4.5	Sanitation
2.8	3.1	3.0	Nutrition
2.4	2.9	2.7	Money management
2.9	3.8	4.1	Employment opportunities
5.4	6.8	6.2	Transportation needs

*Means of ranking from a 1-7 range.

The respondents indicated money management, nutrition, housing, employment opportunities, sanitation, child care, and transportation needs, in decending order, as the problem areas of the EYNP clientele. There was a slight difference in the ordering of mean rankings by the home economists and the youth agents. The home economists followed essentially the overall ordering reversing only sanitation and child care. The youth agents reported housing and nutrition as equally and most important, followed in order by employment opportunities, money management, sanitation, child care, and transportation needs (Appendix C, Table 2).

Some regional differences were apparent as New England respondents listed employment opportunities as the most important need of the EYNP clientele while Pennsylvania and Maryland respondents listed this area of need fourth in importance (Appendix C, Table 2).

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Do you feel that working with the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program is as rewarding for you personally as working with other Extension programs? (Check one).
21	28	49	
19	18	18	Not sure
33	7	18	No
48	74	64	Yes

A higher percentage of EYNP respondents reported receiving personal rewards at least equal to the personal rewards received from participation in other Extension programs, resulting from actual participation in the EYNP than was reported in terms of perceived rewards by the non-EYNP respondents. Further, a higher percentage of the youth agent respondents reported deriving actual or perceived personal rewards from EYNP participation than did the home economists.

A larger percentage of New England respondents reported gaining personal rewards from participation in the EYNP than did the respondents in other states, particularly Pennsylvania. Paradoxically, New England respondents also reported deriving less personal rewards from EYNP participation. This is partially explained by the fact that not one New England respondent recorded a not sure answer for this question (Appendix C, Table 3).

Only seven percent of the EYNP participants reported not receiving at least as much personal reward from EYNP participation as they did from participation in the other Extension programs.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Do you feel that you have to work harder and show more results with this program than with your other Extension programs in order to get an equal raise and consideration for promotion? (Check one).
20	28	48	
35	64	52	Not sure
35	21	27	No
30	14	21	Yes

By a two to one ratio, in terms of percentages, the non-EYNP respondents expressed a feeling of discrimination against those persons who participate in the program than was expressed by the actual participants. Contrarily, and in approximately the same proportion of percentages the EYNP respondents reported not feeling any discrimination in terms of pay raise or promotion considerations as a result of their participation in the EYNP.

Nearly twice as many youth agents felt they did or would receive less recognition from the participation in the EYNP as compared to the amount of recognition received for participation in other Extension programs than was reported by the home economists (Appendix C, Table 3). Overall, about one-fourth of the respondent's reported feeling no discrimination in terms of pay raise or promotion consideration for EYNP participation, about one-fourth felt discrimination in this regard, and about one-half were uncertain about whether or not EYNP participation would generate discrimination in terms of pay raise or promotion considerations. Extension administrators may need to consider the impact of these findings in setting forth explicit salary and promotion criteria for personnel.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Do you think that this program is structured so that recognition is given more to the EYNP youth worker than to the professional home economist? (Check one).
21	27	48	
60	30	43	Not sure
20	48	35	No
20	22	21	Yes

The non-EYNP respondents were twice as uncertain about the focus of reward as were the actual participants. Conversely, nearly two and one-half times as many participants were sure that the focus was not unjust for the professional home economists as were the non-EYNP respondents. About one-fifth of both groupings of respondents felt the spotlight was given to the EYNP worker at the expense of the professional home economist. Only home economists endorsed this latter notion (Appendix C, Table 3). Such a feeling, if not corrected, conceivably could generate a morale problem within the Extension organization by the home economists.

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Has this program resulted in any major change of friends or associates? (Check one).
21	77	38	
24	12	18	Not sure
67	35	53	No
9	53	29	Yes

By a two to one ratio the non-EYNP respondents were either unclear or perceived no change in friends or associates as a result of possible involvement in the EYNP as compared to the EYNP respondents findings. Consistent with this finding, 53 percent of the participants did report a major change of friends or associates since their participation in the EYNP. By contrast, only nine percent of the non-EYNP respondents perceived a change of friends or associates if they were to participate in the EYNP. Again the answer patterns may be influenced by rural-urban differences in location of respondents; but it would not seem to account for all difference reported here. One may conclude that the non-EYNP respondents do not have a realistic view of changes generated by work with such clientele. Such stark realization could be demoralizing and generate role strain.

Nearly twice as many youth agents as home economists reported a major change in friends since their participation in the EYNP (Appendix C, Table 3).

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Has "pressure" from other Extension clientele, fellow workers, and/or advisory committee members been exerted on you as the county Extension worker to do less work with the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program and more work with the rest of the Extension programs? (Check one).
21	27	48	
48	52	50	Not that I am aware of at this time
24	26	25	No
28	22	25	Yes

All respondent categories expressed a great deal of uncertainty in relation to the question of whether or not pressure has been exerted. Moreover, approximately one-fourth of the respondents reported having or anticipated having pressure exerted on them to work in the more traditional Extension program areas. In descending order, Pennsylvania, New England, and Maryland respondents reported some degree of pressure exerted on them to drop the EYNP and return to "the job of Extension" (Appendix C, Table 3).

Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Finally, if you had complete freedom of choice in assigning priorities of programs and clientele in your county, where would you rank this program in relation to all the other possible programs and clientele? (Check one).
21	30	51	
52	71	65	High
33	23	27	Average
10	3	6	Low
5	3	3	Not sure

An overwhelming majority of all respondents ranked the EYNP average to high in terms of program priority. In fact, only three out of the 51 respondents to this question ranked the EYNP low in terms of program priority. Such findings can be taken as a positive attitude by the county based Extension personnel respondents toward the EYNP.

Non-EYNP*	Do you feel that you would receive all the support you need for the EYNP from:
19	(a) Executive Committee
26	Not sure
5	No
69	Yes
21	(b) Advisory Committee
14	Not sure
5	No
81	Yes
23	(c) Professional County Staff
17	Not sure
9	No
74	Yes
23	(d) State Subject Matter Specialist
17	Not sure
4	No
79	Yes
22	(e) Assistant State Leaders and Assistant Directors
14	Not sure
5	No
81	Yes

continued.

Non-EYNP* Do you feel that you would receive all the support you need for the EYNP from:

22

(f) Top State Administrators

18 Not sure
5 No
77 Yes

*Question was asked differently of the EYNP participants and will appear later.

The vast majority of non-EYNP respondents perceived they would receive all the support necessary to implement the EYNP if it was to be added to their county program.

Non-EYNP* Do you feel you will have a choice in whether or not the EYNP is introduced into your county?

23

30 Not sure
9 No
61 Yes

*Question was not asked of the EYNP respondents.

Sixty-one percent of the respondents felt they would have a choice in whether or not the EYNP would be implemented into their county program, 30 percent were undecided on this matter, while one in eleven reported a feeling of no choice in this matter.

EYNP What amount of support do you feel you should receive for your part in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program from:* (Please check one for each group).

22 (a) Your executive committee

14 More than with other Extension programs
72 About the same as with other Extension programs
14 Less than with other Extension programs

22 Do you feel you get this amount of support from this group?

18 Not sure
9 No
73 Yes

20 (b) Your advisory committee

20 More than with other Extension programs
75 About the same as with other Extension programs
5 Less than with other Extension programs

continued

EYNP What amount of support do you feel you should receive for your part in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program from:* (Please check one for each group).

19 Do you feel you get this amount of support from this group?

32 Not sure
10 No
58 Yes

27 (c) The other professional staff personnel in the county

26 More than with other Extension programs
67 About the same as with other Extension programs
7 Less than with other Extension programs

26 Do you feel you get this amount of support from this group?

15 Not sure
19 No
66 Yes

27 (d) The state subject matter specialists

41 More than with other Extension programs
56 About the same as with other Extension programs
3 Less than with other Extension programs

25 Do you feel you get this amount of support from this group?

12 Not sure
4 No
84 Yes

26 (e) The assistant state leaders and assistant directors Regional Superivsors

50 More than with other Extension programs
50 About the same as with other Extension programs
- Less than with other Extension programs

24 Do you feel you get this amount of support from this group?

8 Not sure
4 No
88 Yes

27 (f) The top state organizational administrators

30 More than with other Extension programs
70 About the same as with other Extension programs
- Less than with other Extension programs

continued

EYNP What amount of support do you feel you should receive for your part in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program from:* (Please check one for each group).

25 Do you feel you get this amount of support from this group?

8 Not sure
- No
92 Yes

25 (g) The federal subject matter specialists

40 More than with other Extension programs
60 About the same as with other Extension programs
- Less than with other Extension programs

22 Do you feel you get this amount of support from this group?

25 Not sure
4 No
71 Yes

22 (h) The federal administrators

32 More than with other Extension programs
68 About the same as with other Extension programs
- Less than with other Extension programs

22 Do you feel you get this amount of support from this group?

27 Not sure
5 No
68 Yes

*This question was not asked of the non-EYNP respondents, but is somewhat comparable to one presented earlier.

Obviously the overwhelming majority of respondents expected to receive as much or more support for the EYNP from the various levels of personnel within Extension as they do for other program areas. More importantly, from a personnel and organizational standpoint, this degree of support was expected by the majority of persons who answered this question.

Summary

Throughout the study, logicality and consistency of answer patternings were found. The only finding that might be considered non-logical was the respondents' endorsement of a "grass-roots" philosophy of Extension programming despite increasing evidence toward a more "top-down" approach clearly illustrated by the manner

of initiation of the EYNP under study. Even in the possible exception to logicality however, a pattern of consistency was found in the respondents' answers.

Given the logicality and consistency of the answer patternings, it seems that the reported findings raise significant implications for future Extension programming in the areas of content and organization. If Extension is to continue to be functionally relevant and viable in meeting the demands of current and potential clientele, organizational structure and content must be considered together and not a part from each other as new programs are considered for implementation. One area for immediate programming emphasis is that of ameliorating the "grass-roots"--"top-down" dichotomy that represents a philosophical-empirical problem area.

One finds all categories of non-EYNP respondents plus the less involved respondents (i.e.county agents, agriculture and lay leaders) reporting a lesser felt need for any role redefinition or additional education, and fewer problems in performing their work role than was the case with their EYNP counterparts. Likewise one also finds higher percentages of the youth agents reporting in this manner than was found with the home economists. Finally, Maryland respondents generally expressed the least difficulty with regard to adjusting to the EYNP, the New England respondents expressed an interstitial position, while the Pennsylvania respondents expressed the greatest difficulty. In this regard, the presence of an organizationally recognized and designated youth agent seemed to significantly reduce the amount of problems expressed by the respondents regarding the EYNP, both content-wise and organization-wise.

In terms of personal priorities, most respondents indicated the EYNP should receive a rather high priority in relation to the allocation of Extension's programming resources. Such a finding certainly played no small part in helping to implement the EYNP into an on-going program. However, the respondents were about equally divided in reporting on whether or not system-oriented rewards for EYNP participation were, in fact, forthcoming. Satisfactory clarification of this latter point to the entire Extension staff, whether directly or only marginally involved in the program in question, seems to be imperative if such programs are to become effective over a long time period.

Conclusion

Overall, one must conclude from the findings of this study that innovative programs for new clientele need to be initiated concommitantly with a program for Extension professional and lay personnel in order to minimize adjustment problems of such personnel and to maximize the potential resources for implementing the new programs in question.

Footnotes

1. One of the expressed tendencies by many delivery agencies today seems to be the tremendous, and often unrealistic, expectations on their part of the range of answers social science can and will provide to the problems being encountered. In this regard, the Cooperative Extension Service is not immune as evidenced by the number of respondents who indicated the need for more education in the areas of working with youth and the social sciences. A part of this discrepancy between expectations and performance can only be diminished with reallocation of resource commitments within the system. A second part of the "answer," of course, is for the social scientists to establish with those persons generating these expectations the boundaries of their various social science disciplines.

2. In actual number, there were forty-three counties (Maryland, 6; Pennsylvania, 18; Maine, 5; and Vermont, 13) actually participating in the EYNP at the time of the study. However, Maine's "twin" county units of Androscoggin-Sagadahoc Counties and Pennsylvania's "twin" county unit of Greene-Fayette Counties were counted as one county each in the final number because these two cases were coordinated by only one professional staff in each instance. In the final selection decision, Pennsylvania had two (2) counties that were excluded for personnel reasons (Erie and Greene-Fayette) and a prolonged illness of the home economist forced a third Pennsylvania county (Allegheny) to be excluded from the research universe by Extension Administration. All but one of Vermont's counties (Grand Isle County) were participating in the EYNP to some degree, but only three of the most urban counties were included in the study in order to help keep the environmental setting of the Vermont respondents as close as possible to the other three states.

3. For a more detailed account of the responses given by the county home economists and youth agents and their potential implications for future Extension programming see, Daryl K. Heasley, "Role Strain Expressed By Extension Agents Upon Introduction of a New Program: A Case Study Selected Northeast States." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1971. A summary of this dissertation has been reproduced as Appendix D.

Appendix A

A: Table 1	STATES			COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
Currently, our county is not participating in the EYNP, but:															
	33	*16*	*4*	*15*	-	-	*7*	-	-	*15*	-	-	*16*	-	-
is interested	64	75	75	53	-	-	71	-	-	80	-	-	69	-	-
is not interested	6	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	30	25	25	40	-	-	29	-	-	13	-	-	31	-	-
Do you know where to obtain information concerning the EYNP?															
	66	*31*	*18*	*13*	*14*	*27*	*7*	*11*	*18*	*14*	*21*	*35*	*16*	*19*	*35*
not sure	12	16	-	15	-	7	29	-	11	21	5	11	38	-	17
no	9	16	6	23	7	15	29	-	11	7	-	3	31	-	14
yes	79	68	94	62	93	78	42	100	78	72	95	86	31	100	69
Do you find any sources helpful?															
	19	*9*	*2*	*8*	-	-	*4*	-	-	*12*	-	-	*6*	-	-
no	32	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	83	-	-
yes	68	100	100	87	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	17	-	-
Have you ever wanted additional information?															
	40	*20*	*14*	-	*17*	-	-	*11*	-	-	*24*	-	-	*22*	-
no	43	30	14	-	35	-	-	9	-	-	29	-	-	50	-
yes	57	70	86	-	65	-	-	91	-	-	71	-	-	50	-
How do you see the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program?															
	40	*19*	*14*	-	*17*	-	-	*11*	-	-	*23*	-	-	*23*	-
same as always but new clientele	43	42	21	-	59	-	-	9	-	-	44	-	-	30	-
new program-integrated	48	42	43	-	35	-	-	64	-	-	35	-	-	52	-
new program - not integrated	6	16	7	-	6	-	-	9	-	-	17	-	-	9	-
can't say	3	-	29	-	-	-	-	18	-	-	4	-	-	9	-

continued

A: Table 1 (cont'd.)	STATES			COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
How do you feel about the EYNP?															
	41	18	14	-	15	-	-	11	-	-	24	-	-	23	-
enthusiastic	76	67	36	-	60	-	-	73	-	-	42	-	-	88	-
it's all right	22	17	36	-	27	-	-	18	-	-	42	-	-	6	-
don't know	2	17	28	-	13	-	-	9	-	-	16	-	-	6	-
makes no difference	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
How well do you understand the EYNP?															
	41	18	14	-	15	-	-	11	-	-	24	-	-	23	-
very well	28	33	21	-	27	-	-	45	-	-	42	-	-	4	-
pretty well	41	28	29	-	40	-	-	18	-	-	33	-	-	43	-
in general	29	39	21	-	33	-	-	18	-	-	25	-	-	40	-
don't know	-	-	21	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
don't understand	2	-	7	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	4	-

A: Table 2.	STATES Pa	Md	New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
The EYNP is reacted to by different groups in the county. Please indicate for each group your belief concerning their general approval or disapproval of the EYNP.															
Low income not in program	73	33	17	14	15	29	7	11	18	16	23	39	16	21	37
approve	12	36	6	57	20	38	43	9	22	25	-	10	6	10	8
don't care	32	18	12	21	13	17	29	9	11	19	43	33	31	39	30
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	56	46	82	22	67	45	29	82	67	56	57	57	63	61	62
Low income in program	74	30	17	11	17	28	6	11	17	15	23	38	16	22	38
approve	57	77	59	64	71	68	83	82	82	40	78	63	31	68	53
don't care	16	4	-	9	6	7	17	-	6	7	9	8	19	14	16
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	27	19	41	27	23	25	-	18	12	53	13	29	50	18	31
Farmers	72	35	17	14	17	31	7	11	18	15	21	36	16	23	39
approve	42	37	18	50	59	55	29	18	22	27	29	28	63	17	36
don't care	11	11	6	-	6	3	29	9	17	20	14	17	13	4	8
disapprove	11	6	24	7	6	6	14	18	17	13	-	5	-	30	18
don't know	36	46	52	43	29	35	29	55	44	40	57	50	24	49	38
Farm Organizations	73	33	16	13	15	28	7	11	18	16	22	38	16	22	38
approve	33	30	19	62	33	46	29	18	22	19	9	13	63	23	39
don't care	12	9	19	8	20	14	14	9	11	25	23	24	-	-	-
disapprove	10	21	-	8	14	11	57	9	28	6	9	8	-	14	8
don't know	45	40	62	22	33	29	-	64	39	50	59	55	37	63	53
Executive Committee	73	22	15	11	13	24	5	8	13	14	21	35	16	21	37
approve	81	45	53	55	85	71	40	13	23	79	71	74	81	86	84
don't care	4	5	-	9	8	8	-	13	8	-	5	3	-	-	-
disapprove	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	3	-	10	5
don't know	11	50	47	36	8	21	60	75	69	14	24	20	19	4	11

continued

A: Table 2 (cont'd.)	STATES Pa	Md	New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
Advisory Committee	63	31	17	12	17	29	5	10	15	15	19	34	15	18	33
approve	68	61	59	58	59	59	20	60	47	80	68	74	73	67	70
don't care	5	-	6	8	8	7	-	10	7	-	5	3	-	-	-
disapprove	3	3	-	-	-	-	20	-	7	7	-	3	-	5	3
don't know	24	35	35	34	35	34	60	30	40	13	27	20	27	27	27
County Commissioners	73	31	12	14	16	30	5	9	14	15	20	35	16	21	37
approve	53	45	33	57	69	63	40	44	43	53	40	47	31	48	43
don't care	11	10	-	14	13	13	20	11	14	7	10	9	6	5	5
disapprove	1	3	-	7	-	3	-	-	-	-	5	3	-	-	-
don't know	35	42	67	22	18	21	40	44	43	40	45	41	63	47	53
Rural Non-farm Clientele	73	33	15	14	17	31	6	10	16	16	21	37	16	21	37
approve	27	52	27	50	29	39	33	40	38	50	19	32	38	24	30
don't care	21	15	27	21	18	19	33	30	31	18	38	30	13	-	5
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	52	33	46	29	53	42	33	30	31	31	43	38	49	76	65
Urban Clientele	72	26	16	12	15	27	4	10	14	14	22	36	16	21	37
approve	36	50	44	42	53	48	25	50	43	50	41	44	44	19	30
don't care	13	4	13	25	13	19	25	20	21	-	14	8	7	-	3
disapprove	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	6	-	5	3
don't know	47	46	43	33	34	33	50	30	36	50	36	42	50	76	64
Extension Homemakers Groups	67	35	18	14	16	30	7	11	18	16	22	38	14	20	34
approve	54	63	56	57	56	57	42	55	50	56	45	50	71	65	68
don't care	10	3	-	7	-	3	-	9	6	13	14	13	-	5	3
disapprove	7	-	6	-	6	3	-	-	-	6	14	11	-	5	3
don't know	29	34	38	36	38	37	57	36	44	75	27	26	29	25	26

continued

A: Table 2 (cont'd.)	STATES			COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
Professional Extension Staff	73	35	17	14	17	31	7	11	18	16	24	40	16	20	36
approve	75	91	66	57	82	71	86	82	83	81	79	80	75	80	78
don't care	4	–	6	7	6	6	–	–	–	–	8	5	–	–	–
disapprove	3	–	–	7	–	3	–	–	–	6	–	2	–	–	–
don't know	18	9	28	29	12	20	14	18	17	13	13	13	25	20	22
State Extension Administration	74	35	17	14	17	31	7	11	18	16	24	40	16	21	37
approve	77	83	65	71	82	77	86	82	83	94	83	88	69	57	62
don't care	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	3	–	–	–
disapprove	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
don't know	22	17	35	29	18	23	14	18	17	6	13	9	31	43	38
Welfare Agencies	74	35	18	14	17	31	7	11	18	16	24	40	16	22	38
approve	57	66	72	64	53	58	42	64	56	69	71	70	44	64	55
don't care	4	6	–	–	6	3	–	9	5	13	4	8	–	–	–
disapprove	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
don't know	39	28	28	36	41	39	57	27	39	18	25	22	56	36	45

A: Table 3	STATES Pa	Md	New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
Extension's EYNP is reacted to by different groups in each county. For each of the groups below please indicate how important to you personally their opinions are of the program.															
Low income persons not in program	*69*	*32*	*17*	*14*	*15*	*29*	*7*	*10*	*17*	*14*	*24*	*38*	*12*	*22*	*34*
very important	30	44	53	36	27	31	29	60	47	57	33	42	33	32	32
important	46	38	12	42	47	45	29	20	24	36	50	45	25	41	35
somewhat important	14	16	24	22	20	21	29	20	24	7	13	11	33	5	14
not important	10	2	11	–	7	3	14	–	6	–	4	2	8	22	19
Low income persons in program	*71*	*30*	*17*	*12*	*15*	*27*	*7*	*10*	*17*	*15*	*24*	*39*	*12*	*23*	*35*
very important	61	83	88	50	73	63	86	100	94	73	79	77	50	61	57
important	30	17	6	50	20	33	14	–	6	20	21	21	25	26	26
somewhat important	8	–	6	–	7	4	–	–	–	7	–	2	25	9	14
not important	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	3
Farmers	*69*	*32*	*17*	*14*	*15*	*29*	*7*	*10*	*17*	*15*	*21*	*36*	*13*	*23*	*36*
very important	22	16	29	7	27	17	–	20	12	7	33	22	46	17	28
important	45	47	35	43	33	38	57	40	47	40	57	50	31	48	42
somewhat important	30	25	29	50	27	38	29	30	29	33	10	19	23	22	22
not important	3	12	7	–	13	7	14	10	12	20	–	9	–	13	8
Farm Organizations	*68*	*31*	*17*	*13*	*15*	*28*	*7*	*10*	*17*	*15*	*21*	*36*	*13*	*22*	*35*
very important	18	10	18	–	33	18	–	10	6	20	–	8	38	18	26
important	43	39	18	46	20	32	29	40	35	20	43	33	46	50	49
somewhat important	28	42	41	54	33	43	71	20	41	40	33	36	8	23	17
not important	11	9	24	–	14	7	–	30	18	20	24	23	8	9	8
Executive Committee	*70*	*22*	*12*	*11*	*13*	*24*	*6*	*5*	*11*	*14*	*19*	*33*	*13*	*23*	*36*
very important	64	36	58	55	69	63	67	20	45	79	58	67	54	48	50
important	29	41	33	36	23	29	–	60	27	14	32	24	38	43	42
somewhat important	7	18	9	9	8	8	33	20	27	7	5	6	8	9	8
not important	–	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

continued

A: Table 3 (cont'd.)	STATES			COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
Advisory Committee	63	32	15	12	17	29	6	8	14	14	22	36	12	19	31
very important	60	47	73	50	71	62	67	50	57	50	68	61	50	53	52
important	38	44	13	50	24	34	33	37	36	43	23	31	50	42	45
somewhat important	2	9	13	-	5	4	-	13	7	7	9	8	-	5	3
not important	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County Commissioners	68	30	12	15	14	29	6	8	14	13	20	33	11	23	34
very important	44	63	25	33	64	48	33	62	50	54	60	58	36	35	35
important	37	23	58	40	36	38	17	38	29	31	25	27	36	48	44
somewhat important	16	14	17	20	-	10	50	-	21	15	15	15	28	13	18
not important	3	-	-	7	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3
Rural Non-farm Clientele	68	33	17	15	14	29	7	10	17	15	23	38	11	23	34
very important	12	18	35	7	21	14	29	30	29	27	4	13	27	12	18
important	44	64	29	53	58	55	56	50	53	33	48	42	36	48	44
somewhat important	31	12	35	33	14	24	14	20	18	27	39	34	27	28	26
not important	13	6	-	7	7	7	-	-	-	13	9	11	9	12	12
Urban Clientele	69	27	16	15	15	30	4	9	13	12	23	35	11	23	34
very important	14	37	38	28	14	20	50	22	31	33	17	23	27	22	24
important	48	52	31	37	65	53	50	56	54	42	48	46	36	39	38
somewhat important	29	7	31	21	21	20	-	11	8	25	35	31	27	30	29
not important	9	4	-	14	-	7	-	11	8	-	-	-	9	9	9
Extension Homemakers Groups	67	31	17	14	14	28	7	9	16	15	21	36	13	22	35
very important	19	32	29	-	21	11	42	22	31	13	29	22	38	32	34
important	60	42	35	50	58	54	29	56	44	54	43	47	54	59	57
somewhat important	13	23	29	29	21	25	14	11	13	20	29	25	8	9	9
not important	8	3	7	21	-	10	14	11	13	13	-	6	-	-	-

continued

A: Table 3 (cont'd.)	STATES			COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
Professional Extension Staff	72	33	17	15	14	29	7	10	17	15	24	39	15	22	37
very important	74	79	63	67	86	76	57	70	65	93	67	77	71	73	73
important	19	12	30	20	7	14	29	20	24	7	25	18	21	27	24
somewhat important	7	9	6	13	7	10	14	10	12	–	8	5	7	–	3
not important	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
State Extension Administration	69	33	17	15	14	29	7	10	17	15	24	39	12	22	34
very important	72	76	71	60	79	70	57	80	71	86	83	85	59	68	65
important	23	21	29	33	21	28	43	20	29	14	13	13	33	27	29
somewhat important	3	2	–	7	–	2	–	–	–	–	4	3	8	–	3
not important	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	3
Welfare Agencies	70	33	16	15	15	30	7	10	17	15	23	38	12	22	34
very important	31	36	38	13	40	27	43	30	35	67	18	37	25	41	35
important	41	30	56	53	40	47	29	60	47	26	26	26	41	50	47
somewhat important	21	27	–	27	13	20	14	10	12	7	52	34	17	5	9
not important	7	7	6	7	7	7	14	–	6	–	4	3	17	5	9

A: Table 4	STATES Pa	Md	New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
If you indicated that you feel one or more groups disapprove of the EYNP (table 2) being a part of your Extension effort and yet their opinions are important to you (table 3) do such unfavorable opinions affect the way you do your job?															
	48	*15*	*6*	*6*	*9*	*15*	*4*	*5*	*9*	*8*	*13*	*21*	*11*	*13*	*24*
not sure	23	20	-	33	33	33	25	-	11	50	14	29	18	-	8
no	54	33	17	17	45	33	25	40	33	13	46	33	64	84	75
yes	23	47	83	50	22	33	50	60	56	37	40	38	18	15	17
Do you feel there should be concensus from most groups in the county towards a program before Extension becomes involved?															
	51	*21*	*8*	*9*	*8*	*17*	*4*	*6*	*10*	*10*	*17*	*27*	*12*	*14*	*26*
no opinion	2	5	-	22	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
no	33	57	62	22	62	41	75	50	60	30	65	52	8	43	27
yes	65	38	38	56	38	47	25	50	40	70	35	48	92	57	73

A: Table 5	STATES			COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
Please indicate how important you think the EYNP is for:															
Broadening the scope of the Extension program:	*74*	*35*	*16*	*14*	*16*	*30*	*7*	*11*	*18*	*16*	*23*	*39*	*15*	*23*	*38*
very important	50	51	50	29	44	37	71	82	78	50	48	49	54	39	45
important	38	46	38	71	56	63	14	9	11	44	43	43	33	39	37
not important	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	9	5
not sure	11	3	12	–	–	–	14	9	11	6	9	8	13	13	13
Providing educational opportunities for Extension workers:	*74*	*35*	*18*	*14*	*17*	*31*	*7*	*11*	*18*	*17*	*23*		*15*	*23*	*38*
very important	23	31	28	50	6	26	43	36	39	24	13	17	27	30	29
important	43	54	61	21	65	45	43	55	50	47	57	54	47	43	45
not important	18	3	6	15	23	19	–	9	6	12	13	12	–	14	8
not sure	16	12	6	15	6	10	14	–	6	17	17	17	26	14	18
Providing educational opportunities for Extension Executive Committee members:	*73*	*28*	*15*	*12*	*14*	*26*	*5*	*7*	*12*	*18*	*22*	*40*	*15*	*23*	*38*
very important	15	4	13	8	14	12	20	–	8	11	5	8	20	17	18
important	47	54	27	75	50	61	40	43	42	22	49	35	53	40	46
not important	19	11	–	–	29	15	–	–	–	16	14	15	–	30	18
not sure	19	31	60	17	7	12	40	57	50	51	32	42	27	13	18
Providing educational opportunities for Extension Advisory Committee members:	*65*	*31*	*15*	*12*	*14*	*26*	*6*	*9*	*15*	*15*	*21*	*36*	*14*	*19*	*33*
very important	20	10	7	25	33	30	–	–	–	7	5	6	21	21	21
important	40	52	33	50	27	37	67	44	53	28	51	42	50	37	42
not important	20	13	7	8	27	19	17	22	20	14	15	14	–	26	15
not sure	20	25	53	17	13	14	17	34	27	51	29	38	29	16	22

continued

A: Table 5 (cont'd.)	STATES			COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
Providing educational opportunities for Extension Lay Leaders:	*74*	*33*	*17*	*14*	*15*	*29*	*7*	*11*	*18*	*16*	*23*	*39*	*15*	*23*	*38*
very important	23	45	35	50	13	31	29	36	33	56	17	36	33	22	26
important	55	45	35	37	73	56	57	37	45	31	61	46	47	54	50
not important	11	3	6	13	7	10	-	18	11	-	9	5	-	12	8
not sure	11	7	24	-	7	3	14	9	11	13	13	13	20	12	16
Identifying other problems or opportunities within the county for Extension work:	*74*	*35*	*17*	*14*	*17*	*31*	*7*	*11*	*18*	*16*	*23*	*29*	*15*	*23*	*38*
very important	46	43	24	36	41	2	43	27	33	56	61	59	47	39	43
important	38	48	53	36	53	45	57	64	61	38	35	36	47	35	39
not important	11	9	23	21	6	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	13
not sure	5	-	-	7	-	3	-	9	6	6	4	5	7	4	5
Providing additional resources and personnel for county work:	*74*	*34*	*17*	*14*	*17*	*31*	*7*	*11*	*18*	*16*	*22*	*38*	*15*	*23*	*38*
very important	36	47	18	29	41	35	29	55	44	38	50	45	33	35	34
important	38	41	53	43	59	53	57	36	44	44	36	39	27	37	31
not important	8	3	6	14	-	6	14	-	6	6	-	3	7	12	11
not sure	18	9	24	14	-	6	-	9	6	12	14	13	33	16	24
Assisting in getting better cooperation among various agencies, county leaders and groups.	*74*	*34*	*17*	*14*	*17*	*31*	*7*	*11*	*18*	*16*	*23*	*39*	*15*	*23*	*38*
very important	39	29	41	21	41	32	-	36	22	38	48	44	46	35	39
important	43	50	35	43	53	49	70	46	55	38	39	38	33	47	42
not important	8	15	6	21	6	13	15	-	6	12	9	10	7	9	8
not sure	10	6	18	14	-	6	15	18	17	12	4	8	14	9	11

continued

A: Table 5 (cont'd.)	STATES Pa	STATES Md	STATES New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP	COUNTY AGENTS EYNP	COUNTY AGENTS All	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP	YOUTH AGENTS EYNP	YOUTH AGENTS All	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP	HOME ECONOMISTS EYNP	HOME ECONOMISTS All	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP	LAY LEADERS EYNP	LAY LEADERS All
Providing an additional lever for Extension funding.	*74*	*34*	*17*	*14*	*17*	*31*	*7*	*11*	*18*	*16*	*23*	*39*	*15*	*23*	*38*
very important	27	29	24	7	35	23	15	46	33	25	47	38	14	17	16
important	42	50	41	65	65	65	40	45	44	31	35	33	40	39	39
not important	11	9	6	7	-	3	15	-	6	6	9	8	13	17	16
not sure	20	12	29	21	-	9	30	9	17	38	9	21	33	27	29

A: Table 6	STATES Pa	STATES Md	STATES New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP	COUNTY AGENTS EYNP	COUNTY AGENTS All	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP	YOUTH AGENTS EYNP	YOUTH AGENTS All	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP	HOME ECONOMISTS EYNP	HOME ECONOMISTS All	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP	LAY LEADERS EYNP	LAY LEADERS All
Do you think a program such as the EYNP may eventually lead to change in the type of person elected or appointed to the following three positions.															
Advisory Committee	65	31	16	12	15	27	6	10	16	14	21	35	14	20	34
not sure	34	45	31	42	20	30	50	40	44	28	43	37	29	45	38
no	22	23	19	50	14	30	–	20	12	36	14	23	14	20	18
yes	44	32	50	8	67	40	50	40	44	36	43	40	57	35	44
If yes, changes will be:	33	13	12	5	11	16	2	5	7	7	11	18	9	8	17
not sure	52	69	58	20	82	63	–	100	71	43	64	56	44	50	47
bad	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
good	48	31	42	80	18	37	100	–	29	57	36	44	56	50	53
Executive Committee	73	23	12	14	12	26	4	5	9	16	21	37	15	21	36
not sure	29	70	33	43	25	35	75	60	67	31	43	38	33	33	33
no	41	17	33	43	50	46	–	40	33	19	11	14	27	29	28
yes	30	13	33	14	25	19	25	–	11	50	47	48	40	38	39
If yes, changes will be:	37	10	6	6	5	11	2	1	3	8	13	21	7	11	18
not sure	51	30	83	33	60	45	–	–	–	38	69	57	43	66	56
bad	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
good	49	70	17	67	40	55	100	100	100	62	31	43	57	34	44
Professional Staff	73	29	17	13	15	28	4	11	15	15	24	39	15	22	37
not sure	32	28	29	46	20	32	25	9	13	27	38	33	33	32	32
no	14	31	29	31	7	18	25	27	27	20	4	10	33	36	35
yes	54	41	42	23	73	50	50	64	60	53	58	57	33	32	32

continued

A: Table 6 (cont'd)	STATES Pa	Md	New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
If yes, changes will be:	44	22	12	10	12	22	4	8	12	11	15	26	8	10	18
not sure	61	55	67	10	83	50	25	87	67	36	87	65	62	60	61
bad	5	-	-	10	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	5
good	34	45	33	80	17	45	75	13	33	64	13	35	38	30	34

A: Table 7	STATES Pa	Md	New Eng	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
How much control do you feel you had in deciding whether this program became a part of Extension's educational program at the county level?	73	31	16	15	15	30	4	11	15	16	22	38	15	22	37
much	10	23	25	13	13	13	-	27	20	19	32	26	-	5	3
some	38	48	19	46	27	37	75	18	33	38	41	39	60	27	41
very little	41	13	25	27	53	40	25	27	27	25	23	24	40	32	35
none	10	10	31	7	7	7	-	27	20	6	5	5	-	36	22
not sure	1	6	-	7	-	3	-	-	-	13	-	5	-	-	-
In deciding whether other programs became a part of the county Extension program do you feel that your amount of control with regard to those other programs is:	61	28	14	15	14	29	4	11	15	15	19	34	15	20	35
more than usual	21	36	29	7	29	17	25	73	60	-	42	24	7	30	20
about the same	59	57	71	73	71	72	75	27	40	67	47	56	80	60	70
less than usual	20	7	-	20	-	11	-	-	-	33	11	20	13	10	11

A: Table 8	STATES			COUNTY AGENTS			YOUTH AGENTS			HOME ECONOMISTS			LAY LEADERS		
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All
When more than one group enters into a decision-making situation the relative importance of each of the outcome may vary. Considering 100% as a total decision, what part (if any) do you think each of the following SHOULD play in deciding the kinds of Extension educational programs and the types of clientele you will have in your county?															
	70	32	15	15	15	30	6	8	14	14	22	36	15	22	37
Professional Co. Staff	27	32	27	26	31	28	27	34	31	27	29	28	29	25	26
Executive Committee	23	3	9	14	14	14	13	6	9	14	20	18	20	16	18
Advisory Committee	11	13	11	14	12	13	5	6	5	12	10	11	10	11	10
Clientele	13	25	24	18	16	17	18	22	20	20	18	19	12	17	15
State Extension Administration	10	11	15	12	12	12	11	14	13	10	14	12	7	10	9
County Commissioners	10	11	4	11	10	10	4	4	4	10	8	9	11	9	10
State Specialists	6	5	10	5	5	5	22	14	18	7	1	3	11	12	12
When more than one group enters into a decision-making situation the relative importance of each to the outcome may vary. Considering 100% as a total decision, what part (if any) do you think each of the following DOES have in deciding the kinds of Extension educational programs and the types of clientele served for your county?															
	69	32	15	14	15	29	6	9	15	15	23	38	15	19	34
Professional Ext. Staff	32	35	32	46	28	37	30	30	30	34	38	36	28	26	27
Executive Committee	14	2	8	8	9	8	6	5	5	11	8	9	16	15	16
Advisory Committee	10	2	6	4	9	6	6	5	5	11	8	9	6	7	7
Clientele	11	16	19	11	14	13	11	14	13	14	16	15	11	15	13
State Extension Administration	21	23	20	13	24	19	3	27	17	12	22	18	19	24	22
County Commissioners	5	9	1	7	5	6	8	6	6	8	3	5	15	10	12
State Specialists	7	13	14	11	11	11	37	13	24	10	5	8	5	3	3

A: Table 9	County Agents	NON-EYNP Youth Agents	Home Economists	Lay Leaders
In the future, where do you think the majority of the Extension program for the local level will be determined?				
	15	7	16	15
Local level only	20	14	25	13
Local and state levels	7	14	6	7
Federal and state levels	-	29	13	13
Local, federal and state levels	73	43	38	47
All other combinations	-	-	19	20
What do you think current or future programs of this nature will do to the morale of the Extension Service Personnel at the local level?				
Professional staff men	13	7	13	13
strengthen	23	29	31	38
no difference	54	57	31	47
weaken	23	15	38	14
Professional staff women	13	7	16	13
strengthen	31	29	44	54
no difference	54	57	38	31
weaken	14	15	18	14
Executive Committee members	11	6	14	13
strengthen	18	33	43	47
no difference	73	50	43	38
weaken	9	17	14	14
Advisory Committee members	10	4	14	10
strengthen	30	50	36	40
no difference	60	25	36	50
weaken	10	25	28	10
Unpaid volunteer leaders	13	7	15	13
strengthen	23	43	47	46
no difference	46	15	20	31
weaken	31	43	33	23

A: Table 10	County Agents	NON-EYNP Youth Agents	Home Economists	Lay Leaders
Do you think that the expanded youth nutrition program will make a great impact on the overall trend Extension educational programs will take in the future?				
	14	*7*	*16*	*15*
not sure	29	43	38	47
no	21	–	6	13
yes	50	57	56	40
Do you think such a program as the expanded youth nutrition program will greatly affect Extension organization as we now know it?				
	15	*7*	*16*	*15*
not sure	54	29	38	33
no	13	15	13	60
yes	33	56	50	7
What kind of priority in terms of Extension's commitment of personnel and education resources, do you feel the expanded youth nutrition program should receive in your county if it were to be introduced?				
	14	*7*	*16*	*15*
very high	–	–	13	13
high	21	71	50	60
medium	64	29	31	27
low	15	–	6	–
very low	–	–	–	–
All in all, for Extension, do you think such a program as the expanded youth program in your county would be:				
	12	*7*	*15*	*15*
not sure	33	15	13	13
bad	–	–	–	–
good	67	85	87	87

Appendix B

B: Table 1	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
										TOTAL N'S									
	9	6	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	4	14	2	19	4
Currently, our county is not participating in the expanded youth nutrition program; but> (Check one).	9	6				6	1			10	4	1				14	2		
interested	44	71				83	-			80	75	100				71	100		
not interested	11	-				-	-			10	-	-				-	-		
dont know	44	29				17	100			10	25	-				29	-		
Do you know where to obtain information concerning the expanded youth nutrition program?	7	6	9	3	2	6	1	7	4	9	4	1	12	5	4	14	2	15	4
not sure	14	17	-	-	-	33	-	-	-	22	25	-	-	20	-	43	-	-	-
no	14	33	-	33	-	17	100	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	29	50	-	-
yes	71	50	100	67	100	50	-	100	100	67	75	100	100	80	100	29	50	100	100
Did you find any sources helpful?	4	4				4	0			10	1	1				5	1		
no	25	-				-				-	-	-				100	-		
yes	75	100				100				100	100	100				-	100		
Ever wanted additional information?			9	6	2			7	4				13	7	4			18	4
no			22	50	50			14	0				38	29	-			56	25
yes			78	50	50			86	100				62	71	100			44	75
How do you see the expanded youth nutrition program?			9	6	2			7	4				13	6	4			19	4
same as always; new clientele			56	75	50			14					58	50	25			32	25
new program-integrated			33	25	50			71	50				35	17	25			53	50
new program-not integrated			11	-	-			14	-				77	33	25			10	-
can't say			-	-	-			-	5-				-	-	25			5	25

continued

B: Table 1 (cont'd)	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
How do you feel about the expanded youth nutrition program for low-income persons?																			
			9	4	2			7	4				13	7	4			19	4
enthusiastic			67	50	50			100	25				46	43	25			100	50
it's all right			22	25	50			-	50				54	29	25			-	25
don't know			11	25	-			-	25				-	29	50			-	25
makes no difference			-	-	-			-	-				-	-	-			-	-
How well do you understand the expanded youth nutrition program?																			
			9	4	2			7	4				13	7	4			19	4
very well			22	50	-			43	50				62	14	25			5	-
pretty well			44	25	50			29	-				31	14	50			47	25
in general			33	25	50			29	-				8	72	25			42	25
don't know			-	-	-			-	25				-	-	-			-	50
don't understand			-	-	-			-	25				-	-	-			5	-

B: Table 2	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP Pa	Non-EYNP Md	EYNP Pa	EYNP Md	EYNP New Eng	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP Md	Non-EYNP New Eng	EYNP Md	EYNP New Eng	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP Pa	Non-EYNP Md	Non-EYNP New Eng	EYNP Pa	EYNP Md	EYNP New Eng	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP Pa	Non-EYNP New Eng	EYNP Pa	EYNP New Eng
									TOTAL N'S										
	9	*6*	*9*	*6*	*2*	*6*	*1*	*7*	*4*	*11*	*4*	*1*	*13*	*7*	*4*	*14*	*2*	*19*	*4*
Extension's expanded youth nutrition program is reacted to by different groups in the county. Below please indicate for each group listed <u>your</u> <u>belief</u> as to their <u>general</u> approval or disapproval of this program.																			
Low income not in program	*9*	*5*	*9*	*4*	*2*	*6*	*1*	*7*	*4*	*11*	*4*	*1*	*12*	*7*	*4*	*14*	*2*	*18*	*3*
approve	44	80	11	25	50	50	-	14	-	9	75	-	-	-	-	7	-	11	-
don't care	33	-	11	25	-	33	-	14	-	27	-	-	58	43	-	29	50	28	33
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	22	2-	78	50	50	17	100	71	100	64	25	100	42	57	100	64	50	61	67
Low income in program	*9*	*2*	*9*	*6*	*2*	*5*	*1*	*7*	*4*	*11*	*3*	*1*	*12*	*7*	*4*	*14*	*2*	*19*	*3*
approve	56	100	78	75	50	83	-	100	50	36	67	-	83	57	75	29	50	63	100
don't care	11	-	11	-	-	17	-	-	-	9	-	-	17	-	-	21	-	16	-
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	33	-	11	25	50	-	100	-	50	55	33	100	-	43	25	50	50	21	-
Farmers	*9*	*5*	*9*	*6*	*2*	*6*	*1*	*7*	*4*	*10*	*4*	*1*	*11*	*7*	*3*	*14*	*2*	*19*	*4*
approve	33	80	56	50	100	33	-	29	-	40	-	-	45	29	-	64	50	21	-
don't care	-	-	11	-	-	17	100	14	0	10	50	-	27	-	-	14	-	5	-
disapprove	11	-	11	0	0	17	0	14	25	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	75
don't know	56	20	22	50	-	33	-	42	75	30	50	100	27	71	100	21	50	53	25
Farm Organizations	*8*	*5*	*9*	*4*	*2*	*6*	*1*	*7*	*4*	*11*	*4*	*1*	*12*	*7*	*3*	*14*	*2*	*19*	*3*
approve	50	80	44	25	-	33	-	29	-	27	-	-	8	14	-	64	50	16	67
don't care	13	-	11	-	100	-	100	14	-	18	50	-	42	-	-	-	-	-	-
disapprove	13	-	11	25	-	67	-	14	-	9	-	-	8	14	-	-	-	16	-
don't know	25	20	33	50	-	-	-	42	100	45	50	100	42	71	100	36	50	68	33

continued

B: Table 2 (cont'd)

	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
Executive Committee	9	2	9	3	1	4	1	4	4	10	3	1	13	6	2	14	2	18	3
approve	56	50	89	67	100	50	-	25	-	80	67	100	92	33	50	79	100	82	100
don't care	11	-	11	-	-	-	-	25	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-
don't know	33	50	-	33	-	50	100	50	100	10	33	-	-	67	50	21	-	6	-
Advisory Committee	7	5	9	6	2	4	1	6	4	10	4	1	9	6	4	13	2	15	3
approve	43	80	56	75	50	25	-	83	25	90	75	-	89	33	75	69	100	60	100
don't care	14	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	-
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-
don't know	43	20	33	25	50	50	100	17	50	-	25	100	-	67	25	31	-	33	-
County Commissioners	9	5	9	6	1	4	1	7	2	11	3	1	12	6	2	14	2	18	3
approve	56	60	67	75	100	50	-	57	-	64	33	-	58	-	50	36	50	50	33
don't care	22	-	22	-	-	25	-	14	-	9	-	-	8	17	-	7	-	6	-
disapprove	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	11	40	11	25	-	25	100	29	100	27	67	100	33	67	50	57	50	44	67
Rural Non-farm Clientele	9	5	9	6	2	5	1	7	3	11	4	1	11	6	4	14	2	19	4
approve	33	80	22	50	-	40	-	57	-	55	50	-	18	33	-	29	100	16	50
don't care	33	-	33	-	-	20	100	29	33	18	25	-	45	17	50	14	-	-	-
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	33	20	44	50	100	40	-	14	67	27	25	100	36	50	50	57	-	84	50
Urban Clientele	9	3	8	6	1	3	1	6	4	11	2	1	12	6	4	14	2	18	3
approve	33	67	50	75	-	33	-	67	25	55	50	-	42	17	75	36	100	17	33
don't care	33	-	25	-	-	-	100	17	25	-	-	-	25	-	-	7	-	-	-
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	6	-
don't know	33	33	25	25	100	67	-	17	50	45	50	100	17	83	25	57	-	78	67

continued

B: Table 2 (cont'd)	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
Extension Homemakers Groups	9	5	8	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	11	7	4	12	2	16	4
approve	33	100	63	50	50	50		71	25	55	75	-	45	43	50	67	100	56	100
don't care	11	-	-	-	-	-		14	-	18	-	-	27	-	-	-	-	6	-
disapprove	-	-	13	-	-	-		-	-	9	-	-	18	-	25	-	-	6	-
don't know	56	-	25	50	50	50	100	14	75	18	25	100	9	57	25	33	-	31	-
Professional Extension Staff	9	5	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	4	14	2	17	3
approve	33	100	89	100	-	100	-	100	50	82	75	100	85	71	75	71	100	82	67
don't care	11	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
disapprove	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	44	-	11	-	50	-	100	-	50	9	25	-	-	29	25	29	-	18	33
State Extension Administration	9	5	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	3	14	2	18	3
approve	67	80	100	75	50	100	-	100	50	100	75	100	92	71	75	64	100	56	67
don't care	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	33	20	-	25	50	-	100	-	50	-	25	-	-	29	25	36	-	44	33
Welfare Agencies	9	5	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	4	14	2	18	4
approve	56	80	44	75	50	50	-	71	50	73	50	100	77	57	75	36	100	56	100
don't care	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	14	-	9	25		8	-	-	-	-	-	-
disapprove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
don't know	44	20	44	25	50	50	100	14	50	18	25		15	43	25	64	-	44	-

B: Table 3	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa.	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
	TOTAL N'S																		
	9	6	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	4	14	2	19	4
Low income persons not in program	9	5	9	4	2	6	1	7	3	10	3	1	13	7	4	10	2	18	4
very important	33	40	22	25	50	33	-	57	67	50	67	100	23	43	50	30	50	28	50
important	33	60	56	50	-	17	100	29	-	40	33	-	62	43	25	30	-	50	-
somewhat important	33	-	11	25	50	33	-	14	33	10	-	-	8	14	25	40	-	-	25
not important	-	-	11	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	50	22	25
Low income persons in program	9	3	9	6	2	6	1	7	3	11	3	1	13	7	4	10	2	19	4
very important	44	67	78	75	50	83	100	100	100	73	67	100	77	86	75	40	100	53	100
important	56	33	22	25	-	17	-	-	-	18	33	-	23	14	25	30	-	32	-
somewhat important	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	11	-
not important	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-
Farmers	8	6	9	4	2	6	1	7	3	11	3	1	11	6	4	11	2	19	4
very important	-	17	22	25	50	-	-	14	33	9	-	-	45	33	-	45	50	11	50
important	38	50	44	25	-	50	100	57	-	55	-	-	45	67	75	36	-	47	50
somewhat important	63	33	22	25	50	33	-	14	67	27	67	-	9	-	25	18	50	16	-
not important	-	-	11	25	-	17	-	14	-	9	33	100	-	-	-	-	-	16	-
Farm Organization	8	5	9	4	2	6	1	7	3	11	3	1	11	6	4	11	3	18	4
very important	-	-	33	15	50	-	-	14	-	18	33	-	-	-	-	36	50	17	25
important	38	60	22	25	-	17	100	43	-	27	-	-	55	50	-	55	-	50	50
somewhat important	63	40	22	50	50	83	-	14	33	45	33	-	18	33	75	-	50	22	25
not important	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	29	67	9	33	100	27	17	25	9	-	11	-

Extension's expanded youth nutrition program is reacted to by different groups in each county. The opinions of some of the above groups may be important to you and others not. For each of the groups in the table below please indicate how important to you personally their opinions are of the program.

continued

B: Table 3 (cont'd)

	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	Eng	Md	Eng	Md	Eng	Pa	Md	Eng	Pa	Md	Eng	Pa	Eng	Pa	Eng
Executive Committee	9	2	9	3	1	5	1	4	1	11	2	1	11	6	2	11	2	19	4
very important	56	50	89	33	-	60	100	25	-	73	100	100	82	-	100	55	50	47	50
important	33	50	11	67	-	-	-	50	100	18	-	-	18	67	-	36	50	42	50
somewhat important	11	-	-	-	100	40	-	25	-	9	-	-	-	17	-	9	-	11	-
not important	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-
Advisory Committee	7	5	9	6	2	5	1	6	2	10	3	1	11	7	4	10	2	16	3
very important	43	60	89	50	50	60	100	50	50	50	33	100	83	29	100	50	50	50	67
important	57	40	11	50	-	-	-	33	50	40	67	-	17	43	-	50	50	50	-
somewhat important	-	-	-	-	50	40	-	17	-	10	-	-	-	29	-	-	-	-	33
County Commissioners	9	6	9	4	1	5	1	7	1	11	1	1	11	7	4	9	2	19	4
very important	22	50	18	75	-	40	-	71	-	55	100	-	56	71	50	33	50	36	25
important	33	50	33	25	100	-	100	29	100	27	-	100	27	14	50	44	-	47	50
somewhat important	33	-	-	-	-	60	-	-	-	18	-	-	18	14	-	22	50	11	25
not important	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-
Rural non-farm clientele	9	6	8	4	1	6	1	7	3	11	3	1	12	7	4	9	2	19	4
very important	-	17	12	25	50	33	-	29	33	27	-	100	8	-	-	22	50	5	50
important	33	83	63	50	50	50	100	57	33	36	33	-	33	86	25	44	-	53	25
somewhat important	56	-	12	-	-	17	-	14	33	27	33	-	42	14	75	22	50	26	25
not important	11	-	12	25	-	-	-	-	-	9	33	-	17	-	-	11	-	16	-
Urban clientele	9	6	9	4	2	3	1	6	3	10	1	1	13	7	3	9	2	19	4
very important	-	67	-	25	50	67	-	33	-	30	-	100	23	14	-	22	50	11	75
important	44	33	67	75	50	33	100	50	67	40	100	-	46	57	33	44	-	47	-
somewhat important	33	-	33	-	-	-	-	-	33	30	-	-	31	29	67	22	50	32	25
not important	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	11	-

continued

B: Table 3 (cont'd)

	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
Extension Homemakers Groups	9	5	8	4	2	6	1	7	3	11	3	1	10	7	4	11	2	18	4
very important	-	-	-	50	50	50	-	29	-	-	67	-	40	14	25	36	50	28	50
important	56	40	88	25	-	17	100	57	67	55	33	100	30	71	25	64	-	67	25
somewhat important	11	60	13	25	50	17	-	14	-	27	-	-	30	14	50	-	50	6	25
not important	33	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	33	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Extension Staff	9	6	8	4	2	6	1	7	3	11	3	1	13	7	4	11	2	18	4
very important	56	83	89	75	100	67	-	86	33	92	100	100	69	71	50	64	100	72	75
important	22	17	-	25	-	17	100	-	67	9	-	-	23	14	25	27	-	28	25
somewhat important	22	-	11	-	-	17	-	14	-	-	-	-	8	14	25	9	-	-	-
not important	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Extension Administration	9	6	8	4	2	6	1	7	3	11	3	1	13	7	4	10	2	18	4
very important	56	67	75	75	100	67	-	86	67	82	100	100	92	71	75	60	50	67	75
important	33	33	25	25	-	33	100	14	33	18	-	-	8	14	25	30	50	28	25
somewhat important	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	10	-	-	-
not important	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
Welfare Agencies	9	6	9	4	2	6	1	7	3	11	3	1	13	7	3	10	2	18	4
very important	22	-	22	75	50	50	-	29	33	82	33	-	-	43	33	30	-	33	75
important	67	33	56	-	50	17	100	57	67	18	33	100	15	29	67	40	50	56	25
somewhat important	11	50	11	25	-	17	-	14	-	-	33	-	77	29	-	20	-	6	-
not important	-	17	11	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	10	50	6	-

B: Table 4	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
If you indicated that you feel one or more groups disapprove of the expanded youth nutrition program table 2 being a part of your Extension effort and yet their opinions are important to you table 3, do such unfavorable opinions affect the way you do your job?																			
N'S	*5*	*1*	*8*	*1*	*0*	*3*	*1*	*5*	*0*	*7*	-	*1*	*6*	*5*	*2*	*9*	*2*	*13*	-
not sure	40	-	38	-	-	33	-	-	-	57	-	-	-	40	-	22	-	-	-
no	20	-	50	-	-	33	-	40	-	14	-	-	50	40	50	67	-	84	-
yes	40	100	13	100	-	33	100	60	-	29	-	100	50	20	50	11	100	15	-
Do you feel there should be consensus from most groups in the county towards a program before Extension becomes involved?																			
N'S	*4*	*5*	*6*	*1*	*1*	*3*	*1*	*5*	*1*	*8*	*1*	*1*	*9*	*6*	*1*	*10*	*2*	*14*	*0*
no opinion	25	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
no	-	40	50	100	100	100	-	40	100	25	-	100	56	67	100	10	-	43	-
yes	75	40	50	-	-	-	100	60	-	75	100	-	44	33	-	90	100	57	-

B: Table 5

	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
Please indicate how important you think the expanded youth nutrition program is for:																			
Broadening the scope of the Extension Program	9	5	9	6	1	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	3	13	2	19	4
very important	44	-	56	34	-	83	-	100	50	55	25	100	46	43	67	54	50	52	50
important	56	100	44	65	100	17	-	-	25	36	75	-	46	43	33	46	50	37	50
not important	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-
not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	25	0	-	-	8	14	-				
Providing educational opportunities for Extension workers	9	5	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	2	13	7	3	13	2	19	4
very important	44	60	11	-	-	50	-	43	25	27	25	-	8	14	33	23	50	26	50
important	11	40	44	100	50	50	-	14	-	18	-	-	23	-	-	-	-	16	-
not important	22	-	33	-	50	-	-	14	-	18	-	-	23	-	-	-	-	16	-
not sure	22	-	11	-	-	-	100	-	-	18	25	-	8	43	-	23	50	16	-
Providing educational opportunities for Extension Executive Committee Members	8	4	9	3	2	4	1	4	3	11	6	1	13	7	2	13	2	29	4
very important	13	-	22	-	-	25	-	-	-	18	-	-	8	-	-	23	-	11	50
important	63	100	44	67	50	50	-	75	-	36	-	-	46	57	50	62	-	37	50
not important	-	-	33	33	-	-	-	-	-	9	33	-	23	-	-	-	-	37	-
not sure	25	-	-	-	50	25	100	25	100	36	67	100	23	43	50	15	100	16	-
Providing educational opportunities for Extension Advisory Committee Members	7	5	9	4	2	5	1	6	3	10	4	1	11	7	3	12	2	16	3
very important	14	40	44	25	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	9	-	-	25	-	19	33
important	43	60	22	25	50	80	-	67	-	40	-	-	45	57	67	58	-	31	67
not important	14	-	33	25	-	20	-	17	33	10	25	-	27	-	-	-	-	31	-
not sure	29	-	-	25	50	-	100	17	67	40	75	100	18	43	33	17	100	19	-

continued

B: Table 5 (cont'd)	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
Providing educational opportunities for Extension lay leaders	9	5	9	4	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	3	13	2	19	4
very important	33	80	-	50	-	33	-	29	50	45	75	100	8	29	33	38	-	16	50
important	44	20	89	25	100	67	-	57	-	36	25	-	69	57	33	46	50	53	50
not important	22	-	11	-	-	-	-	14	25	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	16	-
not sure	-	-	-	25	-	-	100	-	25	18	-	-	8	14	33	15	50	16	-
Identifying other problems or opportunities within the county for Extension work	9	5	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	3	13	2	19	4
very important	33	40	44	50	-	50	-	42	-	63	25	100	69	43	67	46	50	47	-
important	56	-	44	50	100	50	100	58	75	27	75	-	31	43	33	46	50	32	50
not important	-	60	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	50
not sure	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	9	-	-	-	14	-	8	-	5	-
Providing additional resources and personnel for county work	9	5	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	6	3	13	2	19	4
very important	22	40	44	50	-	33	-	71	25	45	25	-	62	50	-	38	-	32	50
important	33	60	56	50	100	50	100	29	50	45	50	-	31	17	100	31	-	37	25
not important	22	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	16	-
not sure	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	25	100	8	33	-	31	50	16	25
Assisting in getting better cooperation among various agencies, county leaders, and groups	9	5	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	3	13	2	19	4
very important	22	20	44	50	-	-	-	43	25	45	-	100	46	43	67	46	50	32	50
important	33	60	44	50	100	83	-	57	25	55	-	-	38	43	33	38	-	47	50
not important	22	20	22	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	50	-	8	14	-	-	50	11	-
not sure	22	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	50	-	50	-	8	-	-	15	-	11	-

continued

B: Table 5 (cont'd)	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
Providing an additional lever for Extension funding	9	5	9	6	2	6	1	7	4	11	4	1	13	7	3	13	2	19	4
very important	11	-	44	33	-	17	-	57	25	36	-	-	54	43	33	15	-	11	50
important	44	100	56	67	100	50	-	43	50	27	50	-	46	-	67	46	-	42	25
not important	11	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	29	-	8	50	21	-
not sure	33	-	-	-	-	17	100	-	25	27	50	100	-	29	-	31	50	26	25

B: Table 6	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
Do you think a program such as the expanded youth nutrition program may eventually lead to changes in the type of person elected or appointed to the following three positions?																			
The Advisory Committee	7	5	9	4	2	5	1	6	4	9	4	1	11	7	3	12	2	17	3
not sure	29	60	33	-	-	60	-	33	50	22	50	-	36	57	33	33	-	41	67
no	71	20	-	50	-	-	-	17	25	33	25	100	9	29	-	8	50	24	-
yes	-	20	67	50	100	40	100	50	25	44	25	-	55	14	67	58	50	35	33
If yes, changes will be:	1	4	7	2	2	2	-	4	1	5	2	-	6	3	2	8	1	6	2
not sure	100	-	71	100	100	-	-	100	100	40	50	-	50	67	100	38	100	50	50
bad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
good	-	100	29	-	-	100	-	-	-	60	50	-	50	33	-	63	-	50	50
The Executive Committee	9	5	9	2	1	4	-	3	2	12	3	1	12	6	3	13	2	18	3
not sure	22	80	22	-	-	75	-	67	50	25	67	-	25	83	33	38	-	28	67
no	56	20	56	100	-	-	-	33	50	17	-	100	17	-	-	15	100	33	-
yes	22	-	22	-	100	25	-	-	-	58	33	-	58	17	67	46	-	39	33
If yes, changes will be:	4	2	4	-	1	2	-	1	-	6	2	-	8	3	2	7	-	8	3
not sure	50	-	50	-	100	-	-	-	-	33	50	-	63	67	100	43	-	63	67
bad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
good	50	100	50	-	-	100	-	100	-	67	50	-	38	33	-	57	-	38	33
Professional Staff	9	4	9	4	2	3	1	7	4	10	4	1	13	7	4	13	2	19	3
not sure	56	25	22	-	50	33	-	-	25	30	25	-	23	71	25	31	50	32	33
no	11	75	-	25	-	33	-	29	25	-	50	100	-	-	25	31	50	37	33
yes	33	-	78	75	50	33	100	71	50	70	25	-	77	29	50	38	-	32	33
If yes, changes will be:	5	5	7	3	2	3	1	5	3	9	2	-	9	4	2	7	1	7	3
not sure	20	-	86	100	50	33	-	100	67	44	-	-	89	75	100	57	100	57	67
bad	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-
good	60	100	14	-	50	67	100	-	33	56	100	-	11	25	-	43	-	29	33

B: Table 7	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP		New	Non-EYNP	New	EYNP	New	Non-EYNP		New	EYNP		New	Non-EYNP	New	EYNP	New
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	Eng	Md	Eng	Md	Eng	Pa	Md	Eng	Pa	Md	Eng	Pa	Eng	Pa	Eng
How much control do you feel you had in deciding whether this program became a part of Extension's educational program at the County level?	9	6	9	4	2	3	1	7	4	11	4	1	12	7	3	13	2	19	3
much	11	17	-	25	50	-	-	43	-	18	-	100	25	29	67	-	-	5	-
some	44	51	33	25	-	67	100	29	-	36	50	-	33	71	-	54	100	32	-
very little	33	17	67	25	50	33	-	14	50	36	25	-	42	-	-	46	-	32	33
none	11	-	-	25	-	-	-	14	50	-	25	-	-	-	33	-	-	32	67
In deciding whether other programs become a part of the County Extension program do you feel that your amount of control with regard to these other programs is:	9	6	9	3	2	3	1	7	4	10	4	1	12	5	2	13	2	18	2
more than usual	-	17	33	33	-	33	-	86	50	-	-	-	42	40	50	8	-	28	50
about the same	67	83	67	67	100	67	100	14	50	70	50	100	42	60	50	77	100	61	50
less than usual	33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	50	-	17	-	-	15	-	11	-

B: Table 8	COUNTY AGENTS					YOUTH AGENTS				HOME ECONOMISTS						LAY LEADERS			
	Non-EYNP		EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP		Non-EYNP			EYNP			Non-EYNP		EYNP	
	Pa	Md	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
When more than 1 group enters into a decision-making situation the relative importance of each outcome may vary. Considering 100% as a total decision what part (if any) do you think the following SHOULD play in deciding the kind of Extension educational programs and the types of clientele you will have in your county?																			
	9	6	9	4	2	5	1	6	2	9	4	1	12	7	3	13	2	18	4
Professional Co. Staff	31	17	27	37	35	26	30	34	35	23	34	20	23	41	35	30	20	26	18
Executive Committee	22	2	22	-	5	9	30	6	7	17	6	10	39	3	7	19	25	19	4
Advisory Committee	11	17	10	18	10	14	-	11	13	15	8	5	12	9	13	10	10	10	13
Clientele	16	22	13	20	25	18	15	23	20	15	25	50	10	35	20	10	25	16	23
State Administrators	10	17	9	14	18	11	10	14	14	10	9	10	18	6	14	7	10	8	19
County Commissioners	9	17	11	11	3	11	5	10	5	9	15	5	12	8	13	11	10	10	4
State Specialists	2	6	7	-	10	7	-	4	12	7	3	-	4	2	12	12	3	11	20
When more than 1 group enters into a decision-making situation the relative importance of each to the outcome may vary. Considering 100% as a total decision, what part (if any) do you think each of the following DOES have in deciding the kinds of Extension educational programs and the types of clientele served for your county?																			
	9	5	9	4	2	5	1	6	3	10	4	1	12	7	4	13	2	16	3
Professional Co. Staff	54	31	29	29	25	33	15	37	19	30	43	45	34	41	43	27	38	27	23
Executive Committee	11	3	14	-	3	4	15	3	8	15	3	-	12		8	16	18	17	5
Advisory Committee	4	12	10	9	3	8	-	3	10	11	3	-	8	6	19	7	3	7	8
Clientele	11	12	7	26	25	13	-	14	15	13	19	50	13	20	16	9	25	13	25
State Extension Admin.	12	15	28	24	30	18	60	29	23	12	14	3	27	22	8	22		24	23
County Commissioners	4	11	4	9	-	9	5	8	2	5	19	-	3	4	-	5	3	7	-
State Specialists	3	-	7	3	15	9	5	3	12	6	1	2	8	4	9	15	13	9	15

B: Table 9	COUNTY AGENTS Non-EYNP Pa	Md	YOUTH AGENTS Non-EYNP Md	New Eng	HOME ECONOMISTS Non-EYNP Pa	Md	New Eng	LAY LEADERS Non-EYNP Pa	New Eng
In the future, where do you think the majority of the Extension program for the local level will be determined?	9	6	6	1	11	4	1	13	2
Local level only	22	17	17	-	27	25	-	15	-
Local & state levels	-	17	17	-	-	25	-	8	-
Federal & state levels	-	-	17	100	18	-	-	15	-
Local, federal & state levels	78	67	50	-	27	50	100	38	100
All other combinations	-	-	-	-	28	-	-	24	-
What do you think current or future programs of this nature will do to the morale of the Extension Service Personnel at the local level?									
Professional staff men	8	5	6	1	8	4	1	11	2
strengthen	13	40	33	-	25	25	100	36	50
no difference	50	60	50	100	38	25	-	45	50
weaken	38	-	17	-	38	50	-	18	-
Professional staff women	8	5	6	1	11	4	1	11	2
strengthen	25	40	33	-	45	25	100	55	50
no difference	50	60	50	100	27	75	-	27	50
weaken	25	-	17	-	27	-	-	18	-
Executive Committee members	7	4	5	1	10	3	1	11	2
strengthen	14	25	40	-	50	33	-	45	50
no difference	72	75	40	100	30	67	100	36	50
weaken	14	-	20	-	20	-	-	18	-
Advisory Committee members	5	5	4	-	9	4	1	8	2
strengthen	40	20	50	-	56	-	-	38	50
no difference	40	80	25	-	33	25	100	50	50
weaken	20	-	25	-	11	75	-	13	-
Unpaid volunteer leaders	8	5	6	1	10	4	1	11	2
strengthen	25	20	50	-	40	50	100	45	50
no difference	25	80	17	-	20	25	-	27	50
weaken	50	-	33	100	40	25	-	27	-

B: Table 10	NON-EYNP								
	County Agents		Youth Agents		Home Economists			Lay Leaders	
	Pa	Md	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
Do you think that the expanded youth program will make a great impact on the overall trend Extension educational programs will take in the future?									
	8	*6*	*6*	*1*	*11*	*4*	*1*	*13*	*2*
not sure	25	33	33	100	27	50	100	46	50
no	25	17	-	-	-	25	-	8	50
yes	50	50	67	-	73	25	-	46	-
Do you think such a program as the expanded youth program will greatly affect Extension organization as we now know it?									
	9	*6*	*6*	*1*	*11*	*4*	*1*	*13*	*2*
not sure	44	67	17	100	27	50	100	23	100
no	22	17	17	-	9	25	-	70	-
yes	44	17	67	-	64	25	-	7	-
What kind of priority in terms of Extension's commitment of personnel and education resources, do you feel the expanded youth program should receive in your county if it were to be introduced?									
	9	*5*	*6*	*1*	*11*	*4*	*1*	*13*	*2*
very high	-	-	-	-	18	-	-	8	50
high	22	20	83	-	45	50	100	62	50
medium	67	60	17	100	27	50	-	31	-
low	11	20	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
very low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

continued

B: Table 10 (cont'd)	NON-EYNP								
	County Agents		Youth Agents		Home Economists			Lay Leaders	
	Pa	Md	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	New Eng
All in all, for Extension, do you think such a program as the expanded youth program in your county would be:									
	9	*3*	*6*	*1*	*10*	*4*	*1*	*13*	*2*
not sure	44	–	–	100	20	–	–	15	–
bad	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
good	56	100	100	–	80	100	100	85	100

B: Table 11	Participating Counties (EYNP)																
								Pa			Md			New Eng			
	Co. Ag.	Youth Agent	Home Ec.	Lay Leader	Pa	Md	New Eng	Co. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay
Do you feel that the morale of the:																	
(a) Professional Extension Staff Personnel has:	19	9	21	22	39	18	14	9	12	18	6	6	6	4	3	3	4
gotten better since EYNP	16	11	10	9	8	17	14	11	8	6	33	17	-	-	-	33	-
remained the same	63	89	67	77	74	83	57	67	75	78	67	83	100	50	100	-	25
gotten worse since EYNP	21	-	23	14	18	-	29	22	17	17	-	-	-	50	-	67	75
(b) Advisory Committee has:	13	8	19	15	29	17	9	6	11	12	6	5	6	1	3	2	3
gotten better since EYNP	15	25	5	20	17	14	11	33	9	17	-	40	-	-	-	-	33
remained the same	85	75	79	67	69	86	78	67	73	67	100	60	100	100	100	50	67
gotten worse since EYNP	-	-	16	13	14	-	11	-	18	17	-	-	-	-	-	50	-
(c) Executive Committee has:	12	4	19	22	40	9	8	9	12	19	2	2	5	1	2	2	3
gotten better since EYNP	33	75	16	18	18	-	25	33	17	12	-	-	-	100	-	50	67
remained the same	59	25	68	68	67	89	63	56	67	71	100	50	100	-	100	-	33
gotten worse since EYNP	8	-	16	14	15	11	12	11	17	18	-	50	-	-	-	50	-

B: Table 12	Participating Counties (EYNP)																
								Pa			Md			New Eng			
	Co. Ag.	Youth Agent	Home Ec.	Lay Leader	Pa	Md	New Eng	Co. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay
Did the addition of the expanded youth program to the total Extension program create any difficulties in your county?																	
	16	*10*	*21*	*22*	*39*	*15*	*14*	*9*	*12*	*18*	*3*	*7*	*6*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*4*
not sure	19	30	10	27	10	20	50	11	–	17	–	14	33	50	67	–	75
no	19	20	29	23	21	47	–	11	17	28	67	29	67	–	–	–	–
yes	62	50	61	50	69	33	50	78	83	56	33	57	–	50	33	100	25
If yes, what difficulties?																	
	9	*4*	*15*	*10*	*27*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*11*	*9*	*1*	*3*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*3*	*1*
existing program suffered	11	–	–	–	4	–	–	14	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
other staff overburdened	11	–	–	–	–	67	17	–	–	–	100	33	100	–	100	–	–
programs and staff suffered	33	50	7	–	15	–	17	29	–	22	–	–	–	100	–	–	–
resentment by others	11	–	–	20	7	–	–	14	9	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
received increased demands	–	–	7	–	–	–	–										
from other agencies with similar programs	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
increased program planning difficulties	–	–	7	–	4	–	–	–	9	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
all other combinations	33	50	79	80	70	33	67	43	82	78	–	67	–	–	–	100	100

continued

B: Table 12	Participating Counties (EYNP)																
								Pa			Md			New Eng			
	Co. Ag.	Youth Agent	Home Ec.	Lay Leader	Pa	Md	New Eng	Co. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay
Do you think programs of this nature will lead to significant changes in the educational methods and techniques used by Extension?																	
	17	*10*	*20*	*22*	*39*	*18*	*14*	*9*	*12*	*18*	*4*	*7*	*7*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*4*
not sure	24	10	35	36	33	28	14	33	25	39	25	14	43	–	–	33	25
no	24	10	15	18	13	28	7	11	–	22	25	14	43	50	–	–	–
yes	52	80	50	45	54	44	79	56	75	39	50	71	14	50	100	67	75
Do you think such programs will change the Extension organization as we now know it?																	
	17	*10*	*22*	*22*	*39*	*18*	*14*	*9*	*12*	*18*	*4*	*7*	*7*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*4*
not sure	24	60	41	45	41	44	29	33	42	44	25	71	43	–	33	33	50
no	35	10	23	5	15	28	7	33	17	6	25	14	43	50	–	–	–
yes	41	30	36	50	44	28	64	33	42	50	50	14	14	50	67	67	50
Do you think this program helps to generate a feeling of insecurity on the part of:																	
(1) the professional Extension staff	*17*	*10*	*23*	*21*	*40*	*20*	*13*	*9*	*13*	*18*	*4*	*7*	*7*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*3*
not sure	12	20	22	33	28	10	15	22	23	33	–	14	29	–	33	–	33
no	53	60	57	53	48	70	46	44	46	56	75	71	71	50	33	67	33
yes	35	20	21	14	23	20	39	33	31	11	25	14	–	50	33	33	33

continued

B: Table 12 (cont'd.)	Participating Counties (EYNP)																
								Pa			Md			New Eng			
	Co. Ag.	Youth Agent	Home Ec.	Lay Leader	Pa	Md	New Eng	Co. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay
(2) the non-professional advisory Extension personnel	17	9	21	20	37	17	13	9	11	17	4	6	7	4	3	3	3
not sure	29	33	33	25	35	24	23	33	64	18	50	33	-	-	33	33	33
no	47	44	43	70	54	59	46	56	18	76	25	50	86	50	33	33	67
yes	24	23	24	5	11	18	31	11	18	6	25	17	14	50	33	33	-
Do you feel:	18	10	21	22	38	19	13	8	12	18	4	7	6	4	3	3	4
less secure with EYNP	33	20	30	23	39	26	8	38	58	28	50	29	-	-	-	33	-
same	44	70	60	77	53	74	61	38	33	72	50	71	100	50	67	33	100
more secure with EYNP	23	10	10	-	8	-	31	25	8	-	-	-	-	50	33	33	-

B: Table 13

	Participating Counties (EYNP)																
								Pa			Md			New Eng			
	Co. Ag.	Youth Agent	Home Ec.	Lay Leader	Pa	Md	New Eng	Co. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Co. Ag.	Y. Ag.	Home Ec.	Lay
What kind of priority in terms of Extension's commitment of personnel and educational resources, do you feel the expanded youth program should receive?																	
	19	*10*	*22*	*22*	*39*	*19*	*14*	*9*	*12*	*18*	*6*	*7*	*6*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*4*
High	37	70	23	18	21	63	21	33	8	22	67	71	50	–	67	33	–
Medium	63	30	68	73	74	32	79	67	92	67	33	29	33	100	33	67	100
Low	–	–	9	9	5	5	–	–	–	11	–	–	17	–	–	–	–
Do you feel that if the expanded youth program becomes a long-term Extension program, other specialized audiences will want equal access to Extension's educational resources?																	
	17	*10*	*21*	*22*	*39*	*17*	*14*	*9*	*12*	*18*	*4*	*7*	*6*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*4*
Not sure	41	50	72	59	64	59	36	56	75	61	50	57	67	–	33	67	50
No	18	10	14	5	8	12	21	–	17	6	25	–	17	50	33	–	–
Yes	41	40	14	36	28	29	43	44	8	33	25	43	17	50	33	33	50
If yes, how do you react to this possibility?																	
	14	*15*	*12*	*15*	*27*	*9*	*10*	*7*	*7*	*13*	*3*	*3*	*3*	*2*	*2*	*2*	*2*
Favorably	50	83	33	47	41	56	60	43	29	46	67	100	–	50	50	100	50
Unfavorably	14	–	–	20	11	–	20	–	–	23	–	–	–	50	–	–	–
No reaction	36	17	67	33	48	44	20	57	71	31	33	–	100	–	50	–	50

Appendix C

C: Table 1	Youth Agents			Home Ec.			Pa. Home Ec.			Maryland Youth Agents			Maryland Home Ec.			New Eng		
	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Y.A.*	H.E.	All
Do you feel the need to redefine your role to work with EYNP?																		
	6	*10*	*16*	*15*	*21*	*36*	*11*	*11*	*22*	*6*	*6*	*12*	*4*	*5*	*9*	*4*	*5*	*9*
not sure	17	20	19	-	19	11	-	9	5	17	-	8	-	40	22	50	20	33
no	34	20	25	7	19	14	-	18	9	34	33	33	25	40	33	-	20	11
yes	50	60	56	93	62	75	100	73	86	50	67	59	75	20	45	50	60	56
Would changes make you unhappy?																		
	5	*7*	*12*	*14*	*14*	*28*	*11*	*8*	*19*	*5*	*5*	*10*	*3*	*2*	*5*	*2*	*4*	*6*
not sure	-	15	8	36	21	29	44	38	42	-	20	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
no	80	70	75	64	50	57	56	38	53	80	80	80	100	50	80	100	75	84
yes	20	15	17	-	29	14	-	25	5	20	-	10	-	50	20	-	25	16
Do you feel EYNP creates additional problems?																		
	6	*10*	*16*	*14*	*22*	*36*	*10*	*11*	*21*	*6*	*6*	*12*	*4*	*6*	*10*	*4*	*5*	*9*
not sure	34	10	19	29	27	28	30	27	29	34	-	16	30	33	30	25	20	22
no	17	50	38	29	27	28	10	19	14	17	67	42	50	33	50	25	40	33
yes	50	40	43	42	46	44	60	54	57	50	33	42	-	33	20	50	40	45
Do you feel these problems are created directly by EYNP?																		
		10			*21*			*12*			*7*			*6*		*3*	*3*	
not sure		30			9			-			14			33		67	-	
no		20			24			8			29			67		-	-	
yes		50			67			92			57			-		33	100	
Problems fewer with Non-EYNP?																		
	6	*11*	*17*	*14*	*21*	*35*	*10*	*11*	*21*	*6*	*7*	*13*	*4*	*5*	*9*	*4*	*5*	*9*
not sure	34	18	24	29	19	23	30	18	24	34	-	15	25	20	22	50	20	33
no	17	37	29	29	19	23	10	9	10	17	43	31	75	60	67	25	20	22
yes	50	45	47	43	62	54	60	73	67	50	57	54	-	20	11	25	60	45

continued

C: Table 1 (cont'd)	Youth Agents			Home Ec			Pa. Home Ec			Maryland Youth Agents			Home Ec			New Eng		
	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Y.A.*	H.E.	All
How to handle EYNP?.																		
	6	9	15	15	18	33	11	11	22	6	6	12	4	3	7	3	4	7
drop others																		
use lay leaders	-	-	-	7	22	15	9	9	9	-	-	-	-	33	15	-	50	29
do "old" leave EYNP	-	33	20	33	28	30	-	36	18	-	33	17	25	-	15	67	25	43
priority to EYNP plus "old"	50	33	40	33	22	27	55	36	46	50	50	50	25	-	15	-	-	-
minimum to EYNP priority to "old"	17	11	13	13	6	9	9	9	9	17	17	17	25	-	15	-	-	-
involve fellow workers	17	-	7	13	11	12	28	9	18	17	-	8	25	33	29	-	-	-
"others"	17	22	20	-	11	6				17	-	8	-	33	15	33	25	29

*Since there was only 1 respondent from both the Non-EYNP Youth Agent and Non-EYNP Home Economist categories, these 2 cases were combined with their EYNP counterparts for purposes of analysis.

C: Table 2	Pa Youth Agents Non-EYNP	Pa Youth Agents EYNP	Pa Youth Agents All	Pa Home Ec. Non-EYNP	Pa Home Ec. EYNP	Pa Home Ec. All	Maryland Youth Agents Non-EYNP	Maryland Youth Agents EYNP	Maryland Youth Agents All	Maryland Home Ec. Non-EYNP	Maryland Home Ec. EYNP	Maryland Home Ec. All	New Eng Y.A.*	New Eng H.E.	New Eng All
Do you feel you need more educational background for EYNP work?															
	6	*10*	*16*	*15*	*20*	*35*	*11*	*12*	*23*	*6*	*7*	*13*	*4*	*4*	*8*	*3*	*4*	*7*
not sure	-	-	-	13	15	14	9	17	13	-	-	-	25	25	25	-	-	-
no	33	10	19	13	10	12	-	8	4	33	15	23	50	25	38	-	-	-
yes	67	90	81	74	75	74	91	75	83	67	85	77	25	50	37	100	100	100
If yes, what areas?																		
	4	*9*	*13*	*11*	*15*	*26*	*10*	*9*	*19*	*4*	*6*	*10*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*3*	*4*	*7*
nutrition	50	33	38	45	27	35	50	11	32	50	50	50	-	100	67	-	25	15
housing	25	22	23	45	27	35	40	9	26	25	17	20	100	100	100	-	25	15
home management	-	11	8	36	7	15	40	-	21	-	17	10	-	50	38	-	-	-
working with youth	75	44	54	54	47	50	50	44	47	75	50	60	100	50	67	33	25	29
social science	25	67	54	91	73	85	90	81	84	25	50	40	100	100	100	100	-	43
teaching methods	50	89	77	54	20	35	60	18	42	50	83	70	-	50	33	100	-	43
administrative methods	-	11	8	91	93	92	90	100	95	-	17	10	100	-	33	-	75	43
Please rank in order of importance (1 being most important) the following problems for EYNP clientele.																		
housing	1.8*	3.3	2.8	4.1	2.9	3.5	4.1	3.4	3.9	1.8	3.4	2.7	3.7	2.3	2.4	3.0	2.8	2.9
childcare	5.0	5.3	5.2	4.2	4.9	4.6	3.5	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.9	5.5	6.3	5.5	5.9	3.4	5.2	4.4
sanitation	4.8	3.1	3.7	4.7	5.0	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.0	4.4	5.3	4.8	5.0	1.5	5.4	3.7
nutrition	2.5	3.0	2.8	3.2	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.5	3.9	2.7	4.0	2.3	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.4
money management	4.0	2.9	3.3	1.8	2.6	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	4.0	2.9	3.4	.7	2.3	1.6	3.0	3.6	3.3
employment opportunities	2.7	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.4	4.5	4.0	2.7	3.6	3.2	2.3	4.0	3.3	2.8	1.6	2.1
transportation needs	6.3	5.8	6.0	5.4	6.6	6.1	6.0	6.7	6.4	6.3	5.1	5.7	3.3	7.0	5.4	7.0	6.0	6.4

*mean rank

C: Table 3	Pa Youth Agents Non-EYNP	Pa Youth Agents EYNP	Pa Youth Agents All	Pa Home Ec Non-EYNP	Pa Home Ec EYNP	Pa Home Ec All	Maryland Youth Agents Non-EYNP	Maryland Youth Agents EYNP	Maryland Youth Agents All	Maryland Home Ec. Non-EYNP	Maryland Home Ec. EYNP	Maryland Home Ec. All	New Eng Y.A.*	New Eng H.E.	New Eng All
EYNP - Personally as rewarding as other programs?															
	6	11	17	15	17	32	11	12	23	6	7	13	4	2	6	4	3	7
not sure	33	9	18	13	24	19	18	17	17	33	-	15	-	50	16	25	33	29
no	17	-	6	40	12	28	36	17	26	17	-	7	50	50	50	-	-	-
yes	50	91	76	47	64	53	45	67	57	50	100	78	50	-	33	75	67	71
Must you work harder and show more results with EYNP for equal pay and promotion?															
	6	11	17	14	17	31	10	12	22	6	7	13	4	2	6	4	3	7
not sure	-	56	41	50	65	58	40	67	55	-	71	38	75	50	67	50	67	57
no	50	22	29	29	24	26	30	25	27	50	14	31	25	50	33	25	-	14
yes	50	22	29	21	11	16	30	8	18	50	14	31	-	-	-	25	33	29
Recognition to EYNP worker rather than to you as a Professional?															
	6	10	16	15	17	32	11	12	23	6	7	13	4	2	6	3	3	6
not sure	33	60	50	20	41	31	9	50	30	33	57	46	50	-	33	67	33	50
no	67	40	50	53	24	38	55	8	30	67	43	54	50	100	67	33	33	37
yes	-	-	-	27	35	31	36	42	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	12
EYNP lead to a major change of friends?															
	6	7	13	15	10	25	11	7	18	6	3	9	4	2	6	4	1	5
not sure	17	29	23	27	-	16	9	-	6	17	-	11	75	-	50	-	-	-
no	83	-	38	60	60	60	73	71	72	83	67	56	25	50	33	-	-	-
yes	-	71	39	13	40	24	18	29	22		33	33		50	17	100	100	100
Possiblity of such a change bothersome?															
							10			5			4					
not sure							10			-			25					
no							80			100			75					
yes							10			-			-					

continued

C: Table 3 (cont'd.)	Youth Agents			Home Ec			Pa. Home Ec			Maryland Youth Agents			Maryland Home Ec			New Eng		
	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Non-EYNP	EYNP	All	Y.A.*	H.E.	All
Do you feel, from others, pressure to do less work with EYNP and more with traditional?																		
	6	9	15	15	30	35	11	12	23	6	7	13	4	3	7	2	3	5
not sure	17	67	53	60	57	51	64	42	52	17	71	46	50	33	43	50	67	60
no	33	33	27	20	23	24	9	25	17	33	29	31	50	67	57	50	-	20
yes	50	-	20	20	20	24	27	33	31	50	-	23	-	-	-	-	33	20
If you had complete freedom in assigning priorities for Extension Programs, where would you assign the EYNP Program?																		
	6	10	16	15	20	35	11	12	23	6	7	13	4	5	9	3	3	6
very high-high	50	70	63	53	70	61	46	75	61	50	71	61	75	60	67	67	67	67
average	34	30	31	33	20	26	36	25	30	34	29	31	25	-	11	33	33	33
low-extremely low	17	-	6	7	5	6	9	-	4	17	-	8	-	20	11	-	-	-
not sure	-	-	-	7	5	6	9	-	4	-	-		-	20	11	-	-	-

C: Table 4	NON-PARTICIPATING COUNTIES							
				Home Economists			Youth Agents	
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng
Would you get all the support needed for EYNP work from?								
Executive Committee	11	6	2	11	3	1	3	1
not sure	27	17	50	27	–	–	33	100
no	9	–	–	9	–	–	–	–
yes	64	83	50	64	100	100	67	–
Advisory Committee	10	9	2	10	4	1	5	1
not sure	–	18	50	–	–	–	40	100
no	10	–	–	10	–	–	–	–
yes	90	82	50	90	100	100	60	–
Professional County Staff	11	10	2	11	4	1	6	1
not sure	9	20	50	9	–	–	33	100
no	9	10	4	9	–	–	17	–
yes	82	70	50	82	100	100	50	–
State Subject Matter Specialists	11	10	2	11	4	1	6	1
not sure	–	30	50	–	25	–	33	100
no	9	–	–	9	–	–	–	–
yes	91	70	50	91	75	100	67	–
Ass't. State Leaders & Ass't. Directors	11	9	2	11	4	1	5	1
not sure	–	18	50	–	25	–	20	100
no	9	–	–	9	–	–	–	–
yes	91	82	50	91	75	100	80	–

continued

C: Table 4 (cont'd.)	NON-PARTICIPATING COUNTIES (cont'd.)							
				Home Economists			Youth Agents	
	Pa	Md	New Eng	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng
Top State Administrators	*11*	*9*	*2*	*11*	*4*	*1*	*5*	*1*
not sure	9	18	50	9	25	-	20	100
no	9	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
yes	82	82	50	82	75	100	80	-
Do you feel you will have a choice whether or not the EFNP is introduced into your county?								
	11	*10*	*2*	*11*	*4*	*1*	*6*	*1*
not sure	9	50	50	9	25	-	67	100
no	9	10	-	9	25	-	-	-
yes	82	40	50	82	50	100	33	-

C: Table 5	Youth Ag	Home Ec	PARTICIPATING COUNTIES: Home Economists Pa	Home Economists Md	Home Economists New Eng	Youth Agents Md	Youth Agents New Eng
New friends as a result of EYNP (major change)?							
	7	12	6	3	3	6	1
no	71	25	33	33	-	83	-
yes	29	75	67	67	100	17	100
Colleagues had similar changes whether or not in EYNP?							
	9	18	11	4	3	7	2
not sure	-	33	18	50	67	-	-
no	78	56	73	25	33	71	100
yes	22	11	9	25	-	29	-
EYNP resulted in loss of any "old" friends?							
	9	17	11	3	3	7	2
don't know	44	53	55	33	67	43	50
no	56	35	27	67	33	57	50
yes	-	12	18	-	-	-	-

C: Table 6

		PARTICIPATING COUNTIES					
			Home Economists			Youth Agents	
	Youth Ag	Home Ec	Pa	Md	New Eng	Md	New Eng
What amount of support do you feel you should receive for your part in the EYNP from:							
Executive Committee?	6	16	11	3	2	5	1
more than usual	16	13	9	33	-	-	100
about the same	68	74	82	33	100	80	-
less than usual	16	13	9	33	-	20	-
Get this amount of support?							
	6	16	11	3	2	5	1
not sure	33	13	18	33	-	20	100
no	-	13	9	33	-	-	-
yes	67	74	73	33	100	80	-
Advisory Committee?	8	12	8	1	3	6	2
more than usual	13	25	13	100	33	17	-
about the same	87	68	63	-	67	83	100
less than usual	-	8	25	-	-	-	-
Get this amount of support?							
	8	11	7	1	3	6	2
not sure	38	27	-	-	100	33	50
no	-	18	14	100	-	-	-
yes	62	55	86	-	-	67	50
Other County Professionals?							
	10	17	11	3	3	7	3
more than usual	10	35	36	-	67	-	33
about the same	90	53	55	67	33	100	67
less than usual	-	12	9	33	-	-	-

continued

C: Table 6 (cont'd) Youth Ag

		PARTICIPATING COUNTIES					
			Home Economists			Youth Agents	
	Home Ec	Pa	Md	New Eng		Md	New Eng
Get this amount of support?							
	10	16	10	3	3	7	3
not sure	10	19	10	33	33	14	-
no	10	25	40	-	-	-	33
yes	80	56	50	67	67	86	67
State Subject Matter Specialists?							
	10	17	11	3	3	7	3
more than usual	30	47	55	33	33	14	67
about the same	70	47	45	33	67	86	33
less than usual	-	6	-	33	-	-	-
Get this amount of support?							
	10	15	10	2	3	7	3
not sure	10	13	20	-	-	-	33
no	10	-	-	-	-	14	-
yes	80	87	80	100	100	86	67
Regional Supervisors?							
	10	16	11	3	2	7	3
more than usual	50	50	55	33	50	57	33
about the same	50	50	45	67	50	43	67
less than usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Get this amount of support?							
	10	14	10	2	2	7	3
not sure	20	-	-	-	-	29	-
no	10	-	-	-	-	-	33
yes	70	100	90	100	100	71	67

continued

C: Table 6 (cont'd) Youth Ag	Home Ec	PARTICIPATING COUNTIES: Home Economists Pa	Home Economists Md	Home Economists New Eng	Youth Agents Md	Youth Agents New Eng
Top State Administrators?						
	10	*17*	*11*	*3*	*3*	*7*	*3*
more than usual	30	29	36	–	33	29	33
about the same	70	71	64	100	67	71	67
less than usual	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Get this amount of support?							
	10	*15*	*10*	*2*	*3*	*7*	*3*
not sure	10	7	10	–	–	14	–
no	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
yes	90	93	90	100	100	86	100
Federal Subject Matter Specialists?							
	9	*16*	*10*	*3*	*3*	*7*	*2*
more than usual	33	44	50	–	67	29	50
about the same	67	56	50	100	33	71	50
less than usual	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Get this amount of support?							
	9	*15*	*10*	*2*	*3*	*7*	*2*
not sure	22	27	30	–	33	29	–
no	11	–	–	–	–	–	50
yes	67	73	70	100	67	71	50

continued

C: Table 6 (cont'd.)	Youth Ag	Home Ec	PARTICIPATING COUNTIES: Home Economists Pa	Home Economists Md	Home Economists New Eng	Youth Agents Md	Youth Agents New Eng
Federal Administrators?							
	9	13	10	2	1	7	2
more than usual	33	31	30	-	100	29	50
about the same	67	69	70	100	-	71	50
less than usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Get this amount of support?							
	9	13	10	2	1	7	2
not sure	22	31	40	-	-	29	-
no	11	-	-	-	-	-	50
yes	67	69	60	100	100	71	50

Appendix D

ROLE STRAIN EXPRESSED BY EXTENSION AGENTS UPON INTRODUCTION OF A NEW PROGRAM: A CASE STUDY IN SELECTED NORTHEAST STATES

Summary and Conclusions

The problem of the thesis was to determine the possible amplification of role strain for the statuses of Extension Agent:Youth and Extension Agent:Home Economist due to the introduction of the nontraditional Expanded Youth Nutrition Program (EYNP) into the on-going efforts of the Cooperative Extension Service. The study reports and analysis data were gathered by means of two seperate, but compatible, direct-mail questionnaires. The data were obtained from a parameter of counties participating in and a selected sample of contiguous counties not participating in the EYNP within the states of Maine, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Vermont. The data were gathered from December, 1970 to February, 1971.

The contiguous, non-participating counties were included in the study design as a point of contrast for discerning differences in the patternings of answers. The states included in the study were selected to represent upper, lower, and relatively middle geographic positions within the Northeast Cooperative Extension Service region in order to ascertain sub-regional differences, if any, and to permit generalization of the findings to the Norhteast region.

A total of 134 usable questionnaires were obtained from Extension Lay Advisors and from Extension Agents working in the subject matter areas of agriculture, youth development, and home economics. Questionnaires were returned from respondents in all forty-eight counties (twenty-seven EYNP and twenty-one non=EYNP counties) from the four states.

The questionnaires elicited respondents' feelings about potential or actual participation in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program, their personal opinion of this program as well as their feelings about the rewards or sanctions placed on the program by the bureaucratic social system, and the manner by which they would or did implement this new, nontraditional type of Extension program in their counties.

Because of failure to get sufficiently high rates of return on the questionnaires, the status-role of Extension Agent:Agriculture was excluded from the present analysis. The lay advisor status was also excluded because the role is extremely variable and not compatible in function across the states/regions involved in the study. For these reasons, only the Extension agent status-role of those professionals who work with primarily youth or those who work primarily with home economics subject matter areas were included for analysis.

For these two statuses, analysis was focused on the occupants' perception of the felt magnitude of required role redefinition and the expressed disparities between abilities and/or attitudes held versus what they felt were needed in order to participate in the EYNP. Further, an examination was made to determine whether personal or system rewards were perceived by the respondents as being derived from participation in the Expanded Youth

Nutrition Program. Such rewards might tend to ameliorate any role strain that might arise from participation in the nontraditional type of Extension programming represented by the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program. It was expected that the most dissatisfaction with new roles would be expressed by those status occupants who: 1) felt the greatest need to redefine their existing role and/or to obtain additional educational background in order to perform the new role, and 2) foresaw less personal and system rewards accruing from their participation in the program. In short, those persons who had to change their abilities and attitudes to the greatest degree would experience the most role strain. In the context of this study, any expression of dissatisfaction with one's role in relation to EYNP participation was interpreted as role strain. Furthermore, in the areas just mentioned, the more role strain expressed by the respondents, the greater would be the potential produced for increasing the amount of the disruptive type of change being introduced into the Cooperative Extension Service. Based upon these premises, the following major expected findings were posited:

1) Perceived or actual required change in role definition and additional education seen as necessary by the respondents for their participation in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program will be significantly related to expressed role strain and the amount of disruptive behavior potentially displayed by the respondents.

2) The greater the perceived or actual amount of required role redefinition and disparties between existing and necessary abilities and attitudes felt by the respondents to be necessary in order to perform their roles in the EYNP, the greater will be the amount of role strain expressed and the greater will be the potential for the respondents to introduce disruptive behavior into the system.

3) Personal or system rewards seen by the respondents as forthcoming for their participation in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program will be significantly related to expressed role strain and the amount of disruptive behavior potentially displayed.

4) The greater the perceived or actual amount of personal and system rewards felt by the respondents as being derived from their participation in the EYNP, the greater will be the mitigating forces against role strain and the less will be the potential for the respondents to introduce disruptive behavior into the system.

The data permitted differentiation of participation in the EYNP on the basis of: 1) a comparison by actual involvement in or perceptual involvement (i.e.,non-involvement with) the EYNP, 2) a comparison by the respondents' status-roles within the Cooperative Extension Service, 3) a comparison by the respondents' states/regions, and 4) a combination of these three single classifications for their possible interactive effect.

Because a parameter of counties actually participating in the EYNP was the main focus for study, no tests of statistical significance were used. All differences existing among the lines of differentiation within the independent variable were scrutinized for their possible substantive logicality, consistency and meaningfulness.

Generally, the substantive findings supported the major expected relationships. Those status occupants who felt required to redefine their existing roles in the greatest magnitude also expressed a greater dissatisfaction with their new role than did those categories of respondents expressing a need for a lesser degree of redefinition. It follows from this generalization that the former kinds of respondents also hold the potential for generating more disruptive change in the Cooperative Extension Service than does the latter grouping of respondents. Similarly, those status occupants who perceived the greater discrepancy between their previous abilities and the skills needed to achieve a satisfactory role performance expressed greater dissatisfaction with the EYNP than did persons who saw a lesser disparity between existing and needed abilities in order to perform their EYNP role. Moreover, as one might expect, there was a relationship between those two findings. Those respondents who expressed a greater felt need for redefining their existing role to meet new program demands also expressed, generally, the greater need for additional education in order to compensate for their perceived or actual inadequacies of abilities. The degree of role dissatisfaction expressed from this source, although in the expected direction, was of somewhat lesser intensity than expected.

Expressions of perceived personal rewards for role performance with the EYNP were generally more positive than negative. Of course, this finding represents a modifying effect on the potential for role strain and would also tend to reduce the amount of disruptive change present or potentially present in the system as a result of the EYNP. The fact remains, however, that negative attitudes were present in varying amounts. Such feelings are substantively important and must not be dismissed as unimportant by the Cooperative Extension Service if the EYNP is to be completely effective in reaching the desired objectives.

Respondents' expressions of perceived system rewards for their role performance with the EYNP were generally ambivalent in nature. A part of this ambivalence took the form of uncertainty. That is, the respondents were about equally divided in their opinions regarding whether or not system rewards for EYNP participation was forthcoming, but the majority of the respondents indicated a position of uncertainty in this regard. The supposition throughout the analysis has been that uncertainty can produce role strain and lead to disruptive behavior. Therefore, it was concluded that with the potential for role strain being present as a result of the new program the ameliorating factors were mainly of a personal rather than of a system nature.

Specifically, the non-EYNP classification of respondents expressed a lesser need for role redefinition and additional education than was expressed by the EYNP classification of respondents. Likewise, the Extension agents who work with youth expressed a lesser felt need for role redefinition and additional education than did the Home Economist respondents, and, in particular, those Home Economists who have no "Youth Agent" colleagues. Finally, the categories of respondents from the more urban states/regions expressed a lesser felt need for role redefinition and additional education

than was expressed by the categories of respondents from the more rural states/regions. All of these patternings of answers were in the expected direction. That is, it was anticipated that the non-EYNP categories of respondent would express a lesser need for role redefinition and additional education because of a sense of impersonal detachment from the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program commitments. A similar pattern of answers was expected and found to exist between the categories of youth agent respondents and of Home Economists with regard to this youth-oriented program. Finally, as an urban-oriented youth program EYNP was expected and found to elicit a lesser felt need for role redefinition on the part of respondents in the more urban states/regions categories. The same patternings of answers were found, generally, to exist for the expressions by various categories of respondents of reported role dissatisfactions and problems leading to increased difficulty in their new role performance. Furthermore, the same general arrangement of respondents' answers were found when analyzed in an interactive cross-tabular combination.

The patternings of answers by states/regions followed, generally, this pattern. The Maryland respondents expressed the least difficulty in adjusting to the EYNP program, the New England respondents expressed an intermediate amount of difficulty, and the Pennsylvania respondents expressed the greatest amount of difficulty in adjusting to their new EYNP role.

It was concluded that the expectations concerning the existence of role strain in the various categories of respondents was more supported than denied. Moreover, the potential or present amount of role strain seemed to be tempered by and proportionate to the degree of involvement of one's particular status-role in Extension, and to a much lesser extent, by degree of rurality of the respondents' states. One may conclude from this statement that role strain was less for both categories of Maryland respondents than for the New England respondents, which in turn would be less than for the Pennsylvania respondents when strain is measured as the felt need to redefine a person's existing role. One might also conclude in this regard that Maryland respondents represent the least threat to introduce disruptive change into the system while the Pennsylvania respondents represent the greatest threat along this line. These conclusions were derived from the findings reported in Chapter III.

The respondents who were actually participating in the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program indicated they felt more personal rewards derived from their participation than was felt to be gained by the respondents involved only perceptually. The Youth Agents reported a greater feeling of achieving personal rewards from EYNP participation than did the Home Economists. Both of these findings were in the expected direction. That is, the EYNP respondents have seemingly defined, or are in the process of defining, their role in such a way that allows them to gain more personal rewards than can the non-EYNP respondents gain through projection. The Youth Agents are working more closely to their normal professional line of work, i.e.,a youth-oriented program, than are the Home Economists and thus, have less need to make change than do the Home Economists. Also in the expected direction was the finding that the Pennsylvania Home Economists as a respondent category derived the least sense of personal rewards from EYNP participation. They must bear the major responsibility for the program. Pennsylvania has no Youth Agent position to help with EYNP programs. Thus, in terms of personal rewards gained from EYNP participation, the involved Youth Agents seemed

to display less role strain and thereby represent less potential for introducing disruptive change into the system than the involved Home Economists.

In terms of perceived system rewards, the main finding centered about the generation of a great amount of uncertainty among all categories of respondents concerning whether or not such rewards were forthcoming. These findings were considered to foster role strain. The Pennsylvania Home Economists foresaw less system-based rewards from their participation than did the other respondent categories. It was concluded from the findings of Chapter IV that the meliorating effects of felt personal reward and, to a much lesser degree, the system rewards seen by some respondents reduced the level of role strain engendered by EYNP. One may surmise that if it were not for personal rewards felt to be gained by the majority of all respondents from their EYNP participation, the level of role strain produced would be enough to represent a disruptive threat to the Cooperative Extension Service programming.

Furthermore, our premise has been that role strain existing within the Cooperative Extension Service can lead to disruptive change being introduced into the system. The level of this disruption is the subject of the T_2 study. In this regard, the data consistently pointed to the respondents from Pennsylvania as expressing the most role strain and, therefore, presenting the greatest potential for introducing disruptive types of behavior into the system. Maryland respondents were on the other extreme in this manner, while New England respondents were usually in an interstitial position.

With these background matters cited certain interesting questions remain and need further investigation. For example, what changes will occur in role strain as the EYNP loses its newness? Did this program introduce more role strain for the participants than one might expect from other, more conventional programs? Was the uncertainty concerning perceived system rewards expressed by the respondents in relation to their EYNP participation any greater than would be expressed by these same persons regarding any new program? Between which status-role is the greatest amount of role conflict likely to be produced in situations similar to those created by the introduction of the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program? Could the Cooperative Extension Service have introduced this program in such a manner that would have reduced role strain for the participants? If so, what introductory alterations need to be implemented? At what level is disruptive behavior, if any, being introduced into the Cooperative Extension Service by the Expanded Youth Nutrition Program? It is only through answers to questions such as these that the broad problem of instigated program changes effect on role structure and performance can be pressed forward as it should be.